













# The Westminster Review

Vol. 131

1859.



**Librarian**

**Uttarpara Joykrishna Public Library**  
**Govt. of West Bengal**



## THE LORDS AS OBSTRUCTIVES.

IN a recent article in this REVIEW the question of the policy to be pursued by the Liberal party with regard to the House of Lords was discussed, and a method was suggested by which the veto of the Peers on legislation might be practically abolished.

It was taken for granted, without any lengthy argument, that this power of rejection had been so ill used in the past as to render it imperative that it should no longer be retained. It is probable that nearly all Liberals would assent to this proposition, it being sufficiently well established already; nevertheless, it may be desirable to enter into this branch of the question somewhat more in detail, and to prove, beyond the shadow of doubt, that the Upper House has long been a body of persistent obstructives to measures of reform. In this inquiry it will not be necessary to go further back than the early part of the present century, for it was not till then that collisions between the two Houses became regular and frequent.

When the Commons largely consisted of nominees of the Peers, it was not to be expected that they would be any more eager for democratic reforms than the Lords, and it was not until the constitution of the former had become more popular that disputes were likely to arise constantly. It was not until after the Reform Bill of 1832 that the tendency attained its full development; yet even before then we find that the progressive spirit of the age was making itself felt in the Commons to an extent by no means agreeable to the Lords. This spirit first showed its influence in questions in which no conflict of political opinions was involved—questions simply of justice and humanity; yet even here we find the Upper House taking up an obstinately obstructive attitude.

The Commons were favourable to the abolition of the slave-trade many years before the Lords could be brought to consent to it. And again, when public attention began to be turned to the monstrous barbarities of the old criminal code, though neither House was by any means in full harmony with the enlightened conscience of the nation on this subject, yet it was the Lords who proved themselves the most determined to resist all reform.

The Commons were willing in 1810 to abolish the penalty of death for several offences which, owing to the resistance of the Peers, remained capital on the statute-book until twenty years later.

Among them were such minor crimes as stealing to the amount of 5s. from a shop, or £2 from a dwelling-house, or stealing from vessels in rivers. To come now to a question of a more political character—that of Catholic Emancipation—we observe that the Commons were in favour of removing the disabilities of the Catholics long before the resistance of the Upper House to this measure of justice could be overcome. Before the death of George III. the Lower House had several times voted in favour of emancipation, but the Lords always threw out the Relief Bill; and the same continued to be the case in the following reign. The proposal was brought forward nearly every year in the Commons, and, though not always, there was generally a majority in its favour; but the Peers continued to reject it till they gave way under the menace of civil war in Ireland in 1829.

This brings us close to the epoch of the great struggle over the first Reform Bill. The conduct of the Lords on this occasion is too well known to render any detailed account necessary. At the general election in 1831, fought exclusively on the question of reform, an immense majority in its favour had been returned; yet when the measure was sent up from the Commons to the Lords, they threw it out on the second reading by 199 to 158. The rejection of the Bill raised the greatest excitement throughout the country, and led to disturbances of the most serious character in many places; but even these hardly taught the Peers wisdom. When the Bill was again sent up to them in 1832, they, indeed, passed the second reading by a narrow majority, but an amendment was presently carried in Committee which would have had the effect of ruining the measure. The second rejection of the Bill caused such a state of things as brought the country nearer to civil war than it had ever been since the Revolution of 1688; and it was only when William IV. had at last reluctantly given his consent to the creation of new peers that the Lords submitted to the will of the nation. It was unfortunate, however, that this crisis did not lead to the adoption of some measures for curtailing the powers of the Upper House, for we shall see that, after the Commons had been rendered more truly representative of the nation, collisions between them and the Peers became almost constant.

It would be difficult to name a single great reforming measure of the past half-century which did not meet with obstructive resistance from the Lords—resistance which led, in many cases, to the passing of the measure being delayed for many years, while in others it was carried only in a mutilated form. An instance of the latter kind, where the Upper House did not venture to reject altogether the reform demanded by the people, but where, nevertheless, they did what they could to spoil it, is to be found in the Municipal Corporations Act of 1835. In the form in which the measure left the Commons it pro-

vided that all the members of the reformed town councils should be popularly elected, but the Lords foisted an amendment on the Bill which made one-third of every corporation to consist of aldermen elected by the councillors. It was even made permissible for aldermen to vote in the election of other aldermen. The evils of this system, and its utter inconsistency with the principles of representative government, are now pretty well recognized by all Liberals. The institution of aldermen has been simply a means for perpetuating party domination in municipal councils, and, in many cases, a party which has only a minority of elected councillors is enabled to retain power by the aldermanic vote. The disgraceful practice even prevails in several towns of promoting to the position of aldermen persons who have been rejected by the electors of the wards, a practice which, of course, strikes at the very root of popular representation.

We come now to a measure of simple justice which the Lords did not merely mutilate, but, for many years, refused altogether—the removal of Jewish disabilities. Originally, it was by an accident, merely, that Jews found themselves excluded from Parliament. The Catholic Emancipation Act, while doing away with the obligation for members of Parliament to swear to the royal supremacy over the Church, had substituted a new oath in which the words “on the true faith of a Christian” occurred. The intention of the framers of the oath had been merely to remove an old disqualification, and not to impose a new one; yet it was obvious that the words of the amended oath constituted an obstacle in the way of the admission of Jews to the Legislature. And this barrier, thus inadvertently set up, was maintained by the obstinate bigotry of the Upper House for as long as a quarter of a century in defiance of the wishes of the representatives of the people. In the first session of the reformed Parliament, in 1833, a Bill for the admission of Jews without obliging them to use the words in the oath involving a profession of Christian belief was easily carried through the Commons, but rejected by the Lords, and the same fate befell it in the following year. After an interval of some years the proposal was again brought forward in 1841 and carried by a large majority in the Commons, which showed that it was not merely from the Liberal party that it received support, for the balance of parties was almost equal at that time. The Tory majority in the Lords, however, were more intolerant than many members of their own party in the Lower House, and again threw out the Bill.

At the general election of 1847 the question became one of more practical importance, by the return, for the first time, of a Jewish member of Parliament in the person of Baron Rothschild, who was elected for the city of London. To refuse to alter the words of the oath required from members was now not merely to commit a theoretical injustice, it was to deny a duly elected representative, and



those who had elected him, their constitutional rights. In spite of this, however, the Lords still refused to give way, and succeeded in excluding from the Lower House a member whom the great majority of his colleagues desired to admit.

Even when a second Hebrew member had been returned to Parliament in the person of Mr. Salomons, for the borough of Greenwich, the Peers still persisted in their intolerant exclusiveness. It was not till 1858, twenty-five years after the Commons had first expressed their readiness to remove the Jewish disabilities, that the Lords at length gave way, and Baron Rothschild was allowed to take the seat which eleven years before he had been chosen to fill. Hardly the most extreme Conservative of our day will maintain that the exclusion of Jews was justifiable, so that even he must admit, in this case, the Lords were liable to the charge of being narrow-minded obstructives in the way of a just and necessary reform.

The judgment just expressed must also be pronounced on the action of the Peers in a measure of the same nature as Jewish emancipation—namely, the removal of tests at the universities to enable persons who were not members of the Church of England to take degrees. This reform was carried by a large majority in the Commons as early as 1834, but it was not till twenty years later that the Lords gave their consent to it. The same spirit of ecclesiastical intolerance by which the Peers were so manifestly actuated in these two cases has also influenced them in rejecting another measure of reform which still waits for their sanction, the legalization of marriage with a deceased wife's sister. The Commons have again and again decided in favour of this alteration in the marriage law by large majorities, but the Lords have as repeatedly thrown out the Bill.

It would be tedious to enumerate all the minor legislative measures which have been obstructed by the Upper House, but their action in rejecting the repeal of the paper duty when first proposed by Mr. Gladstone in 1860 deserves special notice. They went so far on this occasion as to continue by their own authority a burdensome tax which the representatives of the people desired to abolish, and it is also to be observed that they were only compelled to give way by means which have a close analogy to the device of "tacking," familiar in the reigns of William III. and Anne, a precedent which it would have been well if the Commons had followed on other occasions. But greatly as England has had cause to complain of the conduct of the Lords in burdening reforming legislation, their offences in this particular have been but venial when compared to the many wrongs which Ireland has suffered at their hands. That unhappy country has had indeed too much reason to protest against the manner in which she has been treated by both Houses of the English Parliament. Both have been always ready to attempt to stifle the demand

for ameliorative measures by passing Coercion Acts; but, while the conscience of the Commons has generally been so uneasy as to induce them to accompany the coercion with at least some semblance of concession, the Lords have felt no such qualms, but have ever shown their preference for a policy of repression. It is not too much to say that, but for their attitude, there was at one period a good chance of reconciling the Irish people to the legislative union with England. Startling as this statement may appear, it can be amply substantiated.\*

It is well known that the formation of Lord Melbourne's Ministry in 1835 was preceded by an arrangement between the Whig leaders and O'Connell, generally known as the "Lichfield House Compact," by which the new Ministry were to receive Irish support on the condition of redressing Irish grievances. This agreement was the subject of the most furious invective at the time from the Tories, and the Whig secessionists who had withdrawn from their party on the Irish question under the leadership of Lord Stanley and Sir James Graham, a political section very similar in its character to the so-called "Liberal Unionists" of our day, and most of whose members ended, as the latter seem to be likely to do, in becoming ultra-Tories. The denunciations of the "Kilmainham Treaty" and of the later developments of Mr. Gladstone's Irish policy seem almost moderate in comparison with the frantic shrieks of the Tory party against Lord Melbourne for his having dared to approach the leader of the Irish people in a spirit of friendliness.

Then, as now, the *Times* was foremost among the anti-Irish Press in virulence and mendacity, and was, if possible, more coarse and vulgar in its raving abuse of the Irish people and their English friends than at present. An impartial historian will, however, not hesitate to pronounce that the alliance of the Whig leaders with O'Connell was honourable to both parties, and was one of the most courageous steps ever taken by an English Minister. Its effect was to render Ireland, during the six years of the Melbourne Ministry, tranquil and legal to an unprecedented degree, merely by a conciliatory administration of the law, by carrying into effect the Catholic Emancipation Act, which had hitherto been a dead letter, and by maintaining friendly relations with the Irish leaders.

O'Connell had announced his intention of suspending his agitation for the repeal of the Union till it was seen whether the Government would be able to carry the Irish reforms they had promised; and there is little doubt that, if justice could have been obtained from the

\* Full particulars of the conduct of the Lords in dealing with Irish measures, especially as regards the part they played in frustrating the endeavours of the Melbourne Ministry to do Ireland justice, will be found in Mr. Barry O'Brien's *Irish Wrongs and English Remedies*, a work which is invaluable to all students of the Irish question, and which no right-minded Englishman can read without a burning sense of shame.

British Parliament, the Irish people would have ceased to demand a Legislature of their own. How was it, then, that the Government were unable to carry out in legislation the same spirit they had displayed in administration? The blame must fall in large measure on the shoulders of the English people in general, who listened with too much readiness to the disgraceful attacks made on the Ministry for their just and wise Irish policy, and displaced them in 1841 almost entirely on that very ground. But, in so far as any one body of men was more guilty than others in the matter, that body was unquestionably the House of Lords. The Whig leaders, in their agreement with O'Connell, had pledged themselves to carry three Irish reforms which were especially called for: (1) the abolition of the tithes paid by the Catholic peasantry to the Established Protestant clergy, and the appropriation of the surplus revenues of the Irish Church to purposes of general good; (2) the reform of the Irish corporations on similar lines to the measure already passed for England; (3) the extension of the parliamentary franchise in Ireland. Accordingly, as soon as Lord Melbourne's Ministry came into office, they proceeded to redeem their promises by introducing a Bill for the commutation of tithes into a rent-charge, and for the appropriation of the surplus revenues of the Established Church for educational purposes. This was but a slight instalment of what was due to Ireland in atonement for the manner in which her poverty-stricken population had for more than two centuries been robbed to support the Church of the wealthy minority of their alien masters, but even this small measure of justice could not be carried. Every year, from 1835 to 1838, the Upper House rejected the appropriation clause; and, in the latter year, the Government had become so much weaker, owing to the persistent agitation against their conciliatory Irish policy, that they were obliged to consent to the passing of the Tithe Commutation Act in a mutilated form without any provision touching the revenues of the Irish Establishment.

The history of the attempt to reform the Irish corporations is of a similar character. These institutions were in a truly scandalous condition. Like the English municipalities, they were for the most part self-elected; like them, but even to a larger extent, they were permeated by jobbery and corruption. But, more than all, they were constituted on a basis of religious exclusiveness; they were strongholds of Protestant and Orange ascendancy, to which no person who professed the religion of the vast majority of the Irish nation could gain admittance.

A measure of municipal reform for Ireland on popular lines, of a similar character to the English Corporations Act of 1835, was introduced in 1836, passed the Commons, and was rejected by the Lords. The same fate befell it in the three following years; and, at last, in 1840, the Government were compelled to agree to the passing of the

Bill in a form which was nearly worthless. Instead of establishing, as had been originally intended by the Ministry, a reformed municipality elected by a popular franchise in each of the sixty-eight corporate towns of Ireland, the measure, as adopted by the Upper House, totally disfranchised fifty-eight corporations, and granted an exceedingly restricted suffrage to the ten remaining towns. The injustice, thus perpetrated, remains to this day, and in Dublin only about 5000 voters enjoy the municipal franchise, though the smallest of the four parliamentary divisions contains nearly double that number of electors, and the total parliamentary register exceeds 40,000.

The Lords were not even content with rejecting or mutilating every measure of Irish legislative reform sent up to them; they went further, and endeavoured, as far as they could, to interfere with the wise and just administration of Ireland under the Melbourne Government. Never, as even so-called Unionists of the present day agree, was there a better administrator in Dublin Castle than Thomas Drummond, Lord Melbourne's Under-Secretary for Ireland from 1835 to 1840. He gained the love and confidence of the people to a degree unequalled by any English official before or since, and put down crime with the ordinary law with greater success than any other Minister has ever achieved under the most stringent Coercion Act. And yet his administration was the subject of the most furious attacks by the Tory and Orange Press, both in Ireland and England, expressly on the ground that he meted out even-handed justice to men of all creeds and races. As ever, the Peers made themselves the organs of bigotry and national prejudice; and, in sheer wantonness it would seem, carried, in 1839, a resolution censuring the Government's Irish administration and appointing a Committee to inquire into it. Thus the best opportunity ever offered of pacifying Ireland was frustrated largely by the action of the Upper House.

Between the fall of the Melbourne Government in 1841 and the accession of Mr. Gladstone to office in 1868 the special sins of the Lords towards Ireland are less manifest, for the reason that no Ministers who held office in the interval ever made any serious efforts to remove Irish grievances. Still, we may notice that on one or two occasions, when the Commons had passed some small measure of justice, the Peers would have none of it.

The Report of the Devon Commission in 1845, a Commission appointed by the Conservative Government of Sir Robert Peel, had the effect of producing for a time in the English mind some slight sense of the iniquity of the land system which England had imposed upon Ireland. The Commissioners forcibly exposed the grievance to which Irish tenants were universally liable of the confiscation of their improvements, and recommended that it should be redressed by legislation. A very modest proposal in this direction was brought

in by Lord Stanley, one of the most Tory members of a Tory Cabinet, but the Lords rejected it. The same fate befell a similar measure introduced in 1852 by Mr. Napier, the Irish Attorney-General in the Conservative Ministry of 1852. When the Ministry of Lord Aberdeen came into power, the Irish land question was a matter with which they were specially pledged to deal; and in 1854 a Tenants' Compensation Bill passed the Commons, but was amended out of existence by the Lords. The disestablishment of the Irish Church in 1869 was almost the only great Irish reform which the Lords were unable to spoil; happily, the country had pronounced emphatically in its favour. They showed, however, what their real feelings were towards the measure by making destructive amendments which they were afterwards forced to abandon.

When Mr. Gladstone made his first attempt to deal with the Irish land question, in 1870, the Upper House were able to assume their usual attitude of obstructiveness with more success. The matter was so involved in dry technicalities that the alterations made by the Lords in the Land Bill were not so well understood, and did not therefore arouse so much popular indignation, as their attempt to mutilate the Church Bill. It seems clear, however, from the general agreement in opinion among those best acquainted with the agrarian question in Ireland, that a measure which, even in its original form, was very imperfect, was so altered by the amendments introduced by the Peers as to be rendered almost practically inoperative.

Even more disastrous in its results was the action of the Upper House ten years later when Mr. Gladstone's second Ministry had to turn their attention to the Irish land question once more. It was evident that in many cases rents could not be paid owing to the exceptionally bad season of 1879, and, as a natural consequence, there would be wholesale evictions, with their usual accompaniments of disorder and outrages. The Government were unable to deal with the whole question in their first session; but, as a temporary measure of relief, they introduced the Compensation for Disturbance Bill, providing for the staying of evictions in cases when non-payment of rent was clearly due to inability on the part of the tenant. This slight attempt to redress a glaring injustice was rejected by an overwhelming majority in the Lords. It may be noticed that on this occasion the greater number even of the so-called Liberal peers opposed the Government, and there had also been a large secession from the Liberal ranks in the Commons on the question. It is a point worthy of remark that in the ranks of those who deserted their party on this occasion may be found the majority of those members of both Houses who at present claim for themselves the title of "Liberal Unionists."

It was now that Dissident Liberalism may be said to have had its birth; its origin is worthy of its later history, and is due to a

determined refusal to deal justly with the Irish people. The Lords had been solemnly warned by the Government of the consequences which were likely to follow from their rejection of the Bill; but they paid no heed; and on their shoulders must lie a very large share of the responsibility for the disordered state of Ireland during the winter of 1880-81. In dealing with the Land Act of 1881, though they did not venture to reject the measure altogether, the Lords, as often before, considerably impaired the value of the reform by their amendments. There is little doubt that it was largely owing to the alterations made by the Upper House that the Act did not prove as complete a settlement of the Irish land question as might have been expected. The striking out of an amendment which the Government had accepted from Mr. Parnell had a very injurious effect on popular feeling in Ireland, as also had the modification of a clause staying evictions pending appeal to the Land Court. To the alteration of the wording of the instructions to the Commissioners relative to the fixing of a fair rent must largely be attributed the fact that the judicial rents have been in many cases calculated on too high a scale. The same game was played with the Arrears Act of 1882; and, though the Government, taught by experience, did not make such large concessions to the Lords as they had done in the previous year, the measure did not pass entirely unscathed through the Upper House.

Such are the wrongs of which Ireland has had to complain at the hands of the Peers—wronges greater even than those of the sister island, considerable as the latter have been. The last and most notable attempt by the Upper House to hinder a great reform was their rejection of a measure of justice to the working classes of the three kingdoms—the Franchise Bill of 1884. It is true that the pressure of public opinion then proved itself so irresistible as to compel the passing of the measure within a few months after it had been rejected, but, unfortunately, the surrender of the Lords on that occasion put a temporary stop to the agitation, which was beginning to be formidable, in favour of effectively dealing with their powers of obstruction. It is time that all Liberals and Radicals faced the question how long a body of hereditary legislators are to be able to reject reforms demanded by the people through their elected representatives. It is sometimes said that the Lords always give way in the last resort, but, even so, there is no reason why a reform which has been approved of by the Commons should require all the turmoil of a popular agitation to pass it into law. And it is only in matters of first-rate importance which deeply stir the public mind that it is practicable to elicit such an unmistakable expression of the feeling of the nation as to frighten the Peers into yielding. On several reforms of minor significance they have been able to maintain their veto for many years.

And, as we have seen, in a still larger number of instances they have seriously impaired the value of measures of reform by their amendments. How is this persistent obstruction to be dealt with? Certainly there appears no method more simple or involving less alteration in the forms of the Constitution than a recourse to the old precedent, which was treated of in our former article on this subject, and referred to at the commencement of the present paper. If the Commons had, in the case of the reforms rejected by the Lords during the present century, followed the example of their predecessors in the days of William III., and had promptly sent up the measure again, tacked to a money Bill, many political misfortunes might have been avoided. If, for instance, when the Upper House, in the most insolent manner, threw out the Compensation for Disturbance Bill in 1880, the Commons had, as was feebly suggested in one or two quarters at the time, attached the measure to the Appropriation Bill, and had then submitted it to the Lords again, they would have been compelled to pass it. Many of the deplorable events which have since taken place in Ireland might never have occurred if the Irish people had had such a strong proof of the determination of the Government and the Lower House to do them justice despite the obstructive attitude of the Peers.

At all events, all Liberals will agree that the present state of things cannot go on much longer; and, though the question may not seem one of immediate practical importance, since the two Houses are at present in an ill-omened harmony of common antagonism to progress and reform, yet we hope and believe that this will cease to be the case as soon as the country has an opportunity of pronouncing its opinion on the conduct of the present Government.

How are the Liberal party prepared to act in the almost certain event of the rejection or mutilation of a Home Rule Bill by the House of Lords? It would be well if a clear and definite scheme for effectively dealing with the veto of the Upper House were thought out by the leaders of the party, and were given a prominent place in the programme to be placed before the country at the next election.

## EXCLUDED PLAYS.

WE propose in the following pages to give some account of the more remarkable instances—instances in a sense historical—of plays excluded from the stage by the authority of the Lord Chamberlain, acting upon the advice of his deputy, the Reader of Plays. A few lines will be sufficient to introduce the subject. “The Lord Chamberlain,” says Mr. John Hollingshead, “is a functionary in England who regulates Court millinery and dramatic literature.”<sup>1</sup> His authority, in the latter function, was first defined by an Act of Parliament passed in 1747 at the instance of Sir Robert Walpole, who had been moved to action by a too liberal allowance of stage satire, and who was adequately revenged by the passing of this measure. Previously to its becoming law, there had been large undefined powers for the regulation of the theatre, vested first in the Master of the Revels, and afterwards in his successor, the Lord Chamberlain. The Master of the Revels, especially, had pains and penalties at his command quite out of harmony with his festive title. From a contemporary document we are enabled to gather some idea of the extent of his powers.<sup>2</sup> He was authorized to command the services of any painters, embroiderers, tailors, property-makers, &c., and, in case of their refusal to obey him, to commit them during pleasure “without bail or main-prize.” Over plays and play-houses he had absolute power, and could either reform or suppress any of the “playing places” he pleased. Musicians paid him an annual fee for a licence to perform in the theatre. All these powers, originally belonging to the Master of the Revels, were inherited by the Lord Chamberlain, when the same duties became part of his office. The probability, however, is that they fell more and more into desuetude, and might have passed away altogether but for certain audacities in political satire,<sup>3</sup> which gave Walpole his excuse, not indeed to impose any new limits on the drama, but to make legal the customary power hitherto exercised by the Lord Chamberlain. In the Lords’ debate on the Bill was made memorable by the celebrated protest of Lord Chesterfield. After an unsparing attack on the principle of the Bill, he concluded by re-

<sup>1</sup> *Plain English*, by John Hollingshead, p. 174.

<sup>2</sup> *Commission to Edmund Tytney, Esq., Master of the Revels*. 1581. Shakespeare Society Papers, 1847.

<sup>3</sup> Fielding’s *Pasquin*: *The Historical Register for 1736*; and *The Golden Rump*, which was the immediate cause of the Act. It was sent to Walpole by Giffard, the manager of Goodman’s Fields.



proaching his peers for attempting to put an excise upon wit. "Wit, my Lords," he finely said, "is the property of those who have it—and too often the only property they have to depend on. It is, indeed, but a precarious existence. Thank God," he said, "we, my Lords, have a dependence of another kind!"

The first victim of the new Act was a tragedy entitled *Gustavus Vasa*, by Henry Brooke, author of *The Fool of Quality*. The prohibition of the play was attributed to Walpole, who was supposed to have been satirized in the character of Trollis, vice-gerent of Christiern, King of Denmark and Norway.<sup>1</sup> *Gustavus Vasa* was afterwards produced with success in Dublin, under the title of *The Patriot*, and was played once at Covent Garden on December 28, 1805.<sup>2</sup> In self-defence, Brooke determined to publish his tragedy, and appealed to the public to enable him to print it by subscription. The town, which was greatly excited by this first instance of the operation of the Act, took its revenge in a characteristic fashion, by damning several new plays that had received the Licensor's sanction, and by subscribing generously for the excluded play. Publishing the tragedy at 5s. a copy, Brooke is said to have cleared more than £1000, and a cheaper edition was soon called for at 1s. 6d. a copy. In the course of a "prefatory vindication," Brooke defended himself with portentous dignity and seriousness.<sup>3</sup> Though inconsiderable in himself, he said, he was yet a subject of Great Britain. He did not consider things minutely, but in general he liked our constitution. His attachments were only to truth; he was conscious of no other principles, and was far from apprehending that those could be offensive. He had taken his subject from the history of Sweden, one of those "Gothic and glorious nations" from which our own form of government is derived. He looked on this performance as the highest compliment he could pay to the present establishment. He had surmounted the many difficulties a new author has to encounter in introducing his play to the stage. His piece had been about five weeks in rehearsal; the day was appointed for acting; many hundreds of tickets had been disposed of, and he imagined he had nothing but to fear from the weakness of the performance. At the moment when he looked for approbation he had met with repulse; he had been condemned and punished in his works without having been accused of any crime; he had been made obnoxious to the Government under which he lived, without having it in his power to alter his conduct or knowing in what instance he had given offence. Even to this, however, he would have submitted without complaint, if he had conceived it to be the intention of the legislature; or if any among the hundreds who had perused the manuscript had observed but a single line that

<sup>1</sup> *Dictionary of National Biography*, vi. 425.

<sup>2</sup> Genest: *History of the Stage and Drama*, iii. 581.

<sup>3</sup> *Gustavus Vasa, the Deliverer of his Country*. A Tragedy, as it was to have been acted at the Theatre Royal in Drury Lane. By Henry Brooke, Esq. London. 1789.

might inadvertently tend to sedition or immorality, he would have been the first to strike it out, he would have been the last to publish it. The Lord Chamberlain's office was to guard against such representations as he may conceive to be of pernicious influence to the commonwealth. The prohibition of this play laid the author under the necessity of publishing it to show that at least he was inoffensive. He would conclude by saying that patriotism had been "the great and simple moral" that he had had in view throughout the play.<sup>1</sup>

That was the author's view. Others who have studied the play seem to have been divided as to the innocence of its intention. Mr. (afterwards Sir) Martin Archer Shee, many years later, defended a play of his own that had been roughly handled by the Lord Chamberlain's reader, on the ground that it was not, like *Gustavus Vasa*, "the vehicle of a pointed satire on kings and priests."<sup>2</sup> Genest, however, was of opinion that, though from the nature of the subject, there was a good deal about liberty in the play, there was nothing about which the Court could reasonably take offence, and takes Shee to task for his criticism, saying he "ought to have been ashamed of the censure which he passed on *Gustavus Vasa*"<sup>3</sup> But a great advocate rose to defend *Gustavus Vasa* at the time of its publication in no less a person than Dr. Johnson. The *Complete Vindication of the Licensers*, by an Impartial Hand, is a lively skit, written in the form of an ironical defence of the Licensor, which, for pungency and pugnacity alike, is not unworthy of its great author.<sup>4</sup> The Impartial Hand begins by saying that Mr. Brooke—a name he mentions with all the detestation suitable to his character—could not forbear discovering the depravity of his mind in his very prologue, which is filled with sentiments so wild and so much unheard of among those who frequent levées and courts, that it is much to be doubted whether the zealous Licensor proceeded any further in his examination of the performance. Is a man without title, pension, or place to suspect the impartiality or the judgment of those who are entrusted with the administration of public affairs? The poet had complained that the Licensor had detained his tragedy one-and-twenty days, when the law only permitted him to keep it fourteen. Where will the insolence of the malcontents end? exclaims the Impartial Hand. Was ever a supplicant dismissed within the time limited by law? Is it not the part of a good judge to enlarge his jurisdiction? It was clemency in the Licensor to detain the play so few days beyond the limit assigned. The Impartial Hand hopes he may live to see a malcontent writer earnestly soliciting for the copy of

<sup>1</sup> *Gustavus Vasa, the Deliverer of his Country*: Pref., 3-5.

<sup>2</sup> *Albano*: Pref., 41. By M. A. Shee.

<sup>3</sup> Genest, x. 244.

<sup>4</sup> *A Complete Vindication of the Licensers of the Stage from the malicious and scandalous aspersions of Mr. Brooke, Author of Gustavus Vasa, with a proposal for making the office of licenser more extensive and effectual.* By an Impartial Hand. London. 1739.

a play which he had delivered to the Licensor twenty years before ! Again, the poet had complained that the Licensor gave no reasons for his refusal. 'This is a higher stain of insolence than before. Is it for a poet to demand a Licensor's reasons for his proceedings ? Is he not rather to acquiesce in the decisions of authority, and conclude that there are reasons which he cannot comprehend ? What is power but the liberty of acting without being accountable ? To lie under a necessity of assigning reasons is very troublesome. Parliament was too well acquainted with the characters of great men to lay the Lord Chamberlain or his deputy under any such tormenting obligations. After a detailed examination of several passages, in which the Government of the day is raked fore and aft with the heavy ordnance of Johnsonian irony, the Impartial Hand concludes by saying that his indignation will not suffice him to proceed further, and that he thinks much better of the Licensor than to believe that he went so far.<sup>1</sup>

Brooke, it seems, was not discouraged by the failure of *Gustavus Vasa* as an acting play, for in 1749 we read of his *Earl of Essex* being produced in Dublin, and subsequently in London. This time, however, Johnson's wit was employed against, not in behalf of, his friend. The *Earl of Essex* originally contained the line—

"Who rule o'er freemen should themselves be free,"

which was the occasion of Dr. Johnson's parody :

"Who drives fat oxen should himself be fat."

*Edward and Eleanor*, a tragedy, by Thompson, was the second victim of the Licensor's zeal. "It was prohibited," says Genest, "after it had not only been rehearsed but advertised for this evening" (March 29, 1739).<sup>2</sup> A manuscript correction, on the other hand, says that the play had only been *underlined* for performance, and was never actually in the bills. The point is only of importance as illustrating the annoyance and vexation to all concerned that would attend a prohibition at the eleventh hour. The reason for the prohibition was simple and perhaps justifiable. The play contained several obvious allusions to the strained relations between George II. and the Prince of Wales. Thompson, who was a *protégé* of the Prince's, was no doubt carried away by his anxiety to please his royal patron. In the very first scene these lines occur, and would not have required an interpreter at the time they were written :—

"Has not the royal heir a juster claim  
To share his father's inmost heart and counsels,  
Than aliens to his interest, those who make  
A property, a market of his honour ?"

<sup>2</sup> Genest, iii. 590.

Nor would the pit have been slow to catch the intention of lines like these :—

“O my deluded father, little joy  
Hast thou in life, led from thy real good  
And genuine glory, from thy people's love,  
The noblest aim of kings, by smiling traitors.”

The allusions to the estrangement between the King and the heir-apparent were only too obvious ; but a simple remedy would have been to have cut them out, not condemned the entire play.

A whole chapter of theatrical history, with the saddest of endings, might be written on Foote's excluded play, *A Trip to Calais*. Foote himself was one of the most vivacious and careless of men. His biographer<sup>1</sup> chose very appropriately for his motto the lines :—

“A merrier man  
I never spent an hour's talk withal ;  
His eye begat occasion for his wit ;  
For every object that the one did catch  
The other turned to a mirth-moving jest.”

Unfortunately, Foote's eye caught the notorious Duchess of Kingston, and his wit unwisely lost no time in turning her into a mirth-moving jest. The Duchess was a lady who had in her time won considerable notoriety. As a young woman she had made herself the subject of gossip by going to a masquerade in the character of “Iphigenia” about to be sacrificed. Later in life she was suspected of bigamy, and afterwards convicted of it.<sup>2</sup> Foote wrote *A Trip to Calais* with the express purpose of exposing the Duchess in the part of Lady Kitty Crocodile ; and succeeded only too well in drawing a picture of hypocrisy, intrigue, and oppression,<sup>3</sup> more or less resembling her grace. The play, however, in its original form, never saw the foot-lights, for the Duchess used her influence with the Lord Chamberlain, and the piece was prohibited. Foote made a spirited protest, but obtained no redress. Amongst other things he said that, to those who “through consciousness were compelled to a self-application, the *Whole Duty of Man*, next to the sacred writings, is the severest satire that ever was written.”<sup>4</sup> At this stage an influential friend of the Duchess intervened and persuaded Foote to suppress the comedy altogether. Foote consented, and wrote to the Duchess, saying that as he had been appealed to by a member of the Privy Council, and at the same time informed that the publication of the comedy would be of infinite ill consequence to her affairs, he would give up to that consideration what neither her grace's offers nor the threats of her agents could obtain. A rather long quotation, in her own words, can only do justice to the Duchess's reply :—

“A member of your Privy Council,” she said, “can never hope to be of

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs of Samuel Foote, Esq.* By William Cooke, Esq. London. 1805. ‘Three vols.

<sup>2</sup> Genest, v. 530.

<sup>3</sup> *Memoirs of Foote*, i. 199.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, i. 200.

a lady's cabinet. I know too well what is due to my own dignity to enter into a compromise with an extortionate assassin of private reputation—if I before abhorred you for your slander, I now despise you for your concessions. It is a proof of the illiberality of your satire, when you can publish or suppress it, as best suits the needy convenience of your purse. You had first the cowardly baseness to draw the sword, and if I sheathe it till I make you crouch like the subservient vassal that you are, then there is not spirit in an injured woman nor meanness in a slanderous buffoon?"<sup>1</sup>

Foote replied in terms of equal compliment, and no great harm would have been done had the matter ended there. But a creature of the Duchess's, one Dr. Jackson, took the matter up, and devoted himself consistently to the ruin of Foote's character and career. Among many slanders, Jackson, in a paper which he conducted, brought one specially odious against the actor. This was afterwards taken into court, but before the case was called the time came round for opening the season at the Haymarket. Foote hesitated about appearing in public whilst labouring under so grave a charge. His friends, however, rallied round him, and the Haymarket opened its doors at the usual time. Many eminent persons were present on the first night; the most interesting names now being those of Burke and Sir Joshua Reynolds. In the course of the evening, Foote came before the curtain, made a short apologetic speech, and was welcomed with great enthusiasm; while the spirit in which his performance was afterwards received showed the friendly disposition of the audience, as well as their belief in his innocence. At the trial, before Lord Mansfield, Foote obtained an easy verdict, it being conclusively proved that the charge had been trumped up by Jackson, acting in collusion with a dismissed servant of Foote's, merely to injure the actor. The charge, however, notwithstanding his acquittal by a jury, preyed on Foote's mind. The *Trip to Calais* was to cost him his life, as the event showed. He felt his health failing, and, to make a certain provision for his declining years, disposed of his patent in the Haymarket to George Colman for a clear annuity of £1600 per annum, with a further sum for the right of acting all his unpublished pieces.<sup>2</sup> He continued to act for a short time in the theatre he had once managed, though he was but the shadow of his former self. He died suddenly at Dover, on October 21, 1777, whilst himself on a trip to Calais, and was buried by torchlight at Westminster Abbey, in the dead of night, followed to the grave by only a few of the many friends he had made in his lifetime.

*A Trip to Calais* was afterwards published in a double form: the piece "as originally written and intended for representation," together with *The Capuchin*, altered from *A Trip to Calais*.<sup>3</sup> The connection

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs of Foote*, pp. 204, 205, 206.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, i. 232.

<sup>3</sup> *A Trip to Calais*, to which is annexed *The Capuchin*: By Samuel Foote, Esq. 1778.

between the two pieces shows how completely Foote was possessed by the spirit of revenge. Foiled in his attempt to caricature the Duchess, he turned his attention to her Grace's pseudo-clerical adviser and friend, and his own most bitter enemy, Dr. Jackson. This person was the Capuchin of the later play, and any one who cares to glance at this forgotten relic of an old theatrical feud will see how Foote's malice and anger bear only too successful comparison with his wit and humour. The circumstances created the keenest interest at the time, and Colman said, in his preface to the plays, that he printed them "in order that the public may not be deceived, and the reputation of the author injured, by the publication of pieces fabricated in order to take an undue advantage of the general curiosity."<sup>1</sup>

Charles Macklin's well-known comedy, *The Man of the World*, was at first refused a licence because it was considered by the Lord Chamberlain to be too bitter an attack upon the Scotch character. Genest says that Cleveland's epigram—

"Had Cain been Scot, Heav'n would have changed his doom;  
Not forc'd him wander, but confin'd him home"—

would have been "a pat motto" for the play.<sup>2</sup> Macklin stated his grievances in a very temperate and forcible letter to the authorities. He admitted the Lord Chamberlain's right to prohibit a play if it could be shown to be offensive to virtue, morality, decency, or the laws of the land. He contended that his play was in favour of all this, and argued, very reasonably, that if the Lord Chamberlain thought otherwise he ought to have specified the passages to which exception was taken. He too complained, like Brooke, of the illegal detention of his play, and concluded by saying that the comedy had been performed many times in Ireland under the immediate patronage and with the full approbation of the Lord Lieutenant. *The Man of the World* was first brought out in Ireland, about 1764, under the title of *The True-born Scotchman*. It was so popular there that managers always stipulated with Macklin, before engaging him, that this play should be included in his repertory, and performed alternately with his *True-born Irishman* at least once or twice every week.<sup>3</sup> The success of the piece in Ireland induced Macklin, many years later, to produce a new version of it for the English stage. The cunning and duplicity of Sir Peter Macsycophant, the chief character and a Scotchman, formed the only possible ground of objection to the piece. To meet the wishes of the Licenser, Macklin consented to soften in some degree the asperities of his hero; and the piece was eventually produced at Covent Garden, May 10, 1781.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs of Foote*; Pref.

<sup>2</sup> Genest, vi. 196.

<sup>3</sup> *Memoirs of Charles Macklin, Comedian*, i. 294. London. 1804.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid*, i. 296.

It excited great interest, being the work of a man considerably over eighty years of age, who was himself to sustain the leading part. Contemporary critics agree in saying that Macklin's Sir Peter Macsycophant was equalled only by his Shylock.<sup>1</sup> Unflattering as it sounds to the subject of their compliment, they assert that the natural expression of his features corresponded with the cunning, hypocrisy, and violent temper of the character; and his memory, though it was at that time beginning to show signs of failure, never deserted him through the whole of the long part. The prologue was written by one Pillon, a writer of farces, who volunteered it to Macklin, but afterwards sought and obtained from him a loan of £7. Upon which Macklin observed, with characteristic sharpness, that, had Dryden been alive, he could have bought a prologue for a pound less!<sup>2</sup>

*The Man of the World* has always been considered a good comedy. It is well written and constructed with due regard to the dramatic unities. "The whole of the comedy, it has been said, exhibits a chain of connected facts, of which each scene makes a link, and each link, accordingly, produces some incident relative to the catastrophe."<sup>3</sup> Macklin understood well the value of the method of contrast in characterization. Nothing can be better than the contrasted characters of the grasping, avaricious, self-seeking father, Sir Pertinax Macsycophant, and his generous, disinterested, liberal son. Some years later, when Macklin's great age and increasing infirmities had compelled his retirement from the stage, a proposal was made for publishing his two comedies, *The Man of the World* and *Love à la Mode*, by subscription, for his benefit. The prospectus,<sup>4</sup> drawn up by a friendly hand, sets forth that "this appeal was made in behalf of a man who had lived to the age of ninety-two, and of that long life had passed near seventy years under the eye of the public, at all times diligent in his business, and now a worn-out veteran in the service of the drama." The plays were published in quarto, and the subscription realized the handsome sum of £1580, which Macklin said he regarded as "an honourable dismissal from a profession which he always loved, but could no longer follow."<sup>5</sup>

*The Whim*, a comedy of no great merit, in three acts, by Lady Eglantine Wallace, was prohibited for a very obvious satirical allusion to the King's mistress. In Act 2, Scene 1, Fag says to Nell: "Why, faith, Nell, you have a great fault as times go. You know old women are quite the fashion. You are too young. But, egad, I

<sup>1</sup> Cooke afterwards played Sir Pertinax so well as to make it doubtful whether he did not excel Macklin. It was, however, objected to Cooke that he never acquired the Scotch accent required for the part.

<sup>2</sup> *Memirs of Charles Macklin, Comedian*, i. 300.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, i. 299, 300.

<sup>4</sup> *Harlequin's Collection of Dramatic Tracts and Papers* (British Museum).

<sup>5</sup> *The Man of the World*, a Comedy; and *Love à la Mode*, a Farce. By Mr. Charles Macklin. London. 1793.

shall please myself. I shall ever prefer the symmetry of Venus and the rosy health of young Hebe to all the fat forties of fashion." This passage placed the unhappy Licensor on the horns of an unfortunate dilemma. He could not let it pass, because the reference was not to be mistaken. On the other hand, he could not strike it out, because that would have been equal to allowing the force of the application. He extricated himself by the rough-and-ready way of condemning the entire piece. Unfortunately, it had been written for production at Margate, in aid of a charitable object; and not only that, but the day of representation had arrived, and the house was full to overflowing. As the curtain was about to rise the Licensor's veto arrived, depriving the audience of their pleasure and the charity of its benefaction. Lady Wallace's indignation was extreme. She published her comedy, with a preface, which may have sounded scathing at the time, but to our ears sounds rather ridiculous.<sup>1</sup> She would not have believed it possible that the hand of power could be outstretched "to blast all her fairy-dreams" of feeding the hungry and relieving the sick. There may be "philosophers who think it bad policy to alleviate the miseries of the lower order of mankind," but her ladyship was not one of these, and would be proud if she could turn her abilities to procure the comforts of existence for all her fellow creatures. Her ladyship's conclusion is that "the stage is the only school which overgrown boys and girls can go to, and did the Licensor permit more satire, more sentiment, and less ribaldry, outré pantomime, and folly to appear under his auspices, it would be doing the State more service, than thus taking the alarm at *The Whim* of renewing the Saturnalia Feast,"

Theodore Hook's farce, *Killing no Murder*, produced at the Haymarket in 1809, was at first refused a licence, owing to a very, virtulent and undisguised attack upon the Methodists. The piece was afterwards published with a characteristic preface by Hook, and with the excised matter printed separately at the end.<sup>2</sup> The passage objected to ran as follows:—

"Apollo Belvi.—I ordained myself and preached in a field, but I couldn't get a living by it.

"Buskin.—You a preacher!

"Apollo Belvi.—Yes, and a teacher. Now, I'll tell you how it was. Over against my master's office, right opposite, lived an old dissenting minister, by trade a tailor, and by calling a minister. Dear master! he used to discourse delightfully, and he—he, Mr. Buskin, had a daughter; so to get favour in her eyes, I turned to and fell a-preaching like anything, myself.

"Buskin.—What a queer gig you must have looked in a pulpit.

"Apollo Belvi.—A tub, as I hope to be saved it was no better. . . . So

<sup>1</sup> *The Whim*: a Comedy in Three Acts. By Lady Wallace. With an address to the public upon the arbitrary and unjust aspersions of the Licensor against its political sentiments. Offered to be acted for the benefit of the hospital and poor of the Isle of Thanet, but refused the royal licence. Margate. 1795.

<sup>2</sup> *Killing no Murder*: a Farce. By T. E. Hook. London. 1809.



I preached and preached—la! how I did preach—till at last I preached myself plump into the heart of my young saint."

Hook, with the courage of youth—he was only twenty-one—determined to beard the Licenser in his den. He gives an amusing account of his adventure.<sup>1</sup>

"I set off in search of the gentleman who had strangled my literary infant in his birth, and to find him I referred to the Red Book, where I discovered that John Larpent, Esq., was *clerk* at the Privy Seal Office, that John Larpent, Esq., was *deputy* to John Larpent, Esq., and that the *deputy's secretary* was John Larpent, Esq. This proved to me that a man could be in three places at once; but on inquiry I found that he was even in a fourth and fifth; for it was by virtue of none of these offices he licensed plays, and his place, *i.e.*, his villa, was at Putney. Thither I proceeded in a post-chaise in search of this ubiquitous deputy, and there I found him. After a reasonable delay, to begot an awful attention on my part, he appeared."

Mr. Larpent described the second act of the piece to young Hook as a most indecent and shameful attack on a very religious and harmless set of people. For once the censorship justified its existence, and the sentence, no doubt, was as just as it was severe. Mr. Larpent, however, was less happy in his further observations, and struck a wrong note altogether when he said in self-defence that "Government did not wish the Methodists to be ridiculed." When the piece was at last produced, it was found that Hook had suitably revenged himself on his enemy the Deputy-licenser. A few lines were introduced which were unmistakably pointed at Mr. Larpent, and Hook says he had the gratification of hearing the audience every night apply them properly. Apollo Belvi. is made to say:—

"At last we got into a sad scrape, for, having advertised the farce of *The Devil to Pay*, old Justice Carpat, who, between you and I, was a bit of a shoemaker, hearing us how it contained some personal reflections: the cobblering profession, stopped the performance and threatened to d us all to the stocks."

The terms in which Hook excuses his piece throw considerable light on the attitude of society to the Methodists at the beginning of the century, and mark the great advance in religious liberty and toleration which has been made in recent times. Hook speaks without a grain of charity of "the ignorance and impudence of the self-elected pastors who infest every part of the kingdom." He was utterly surprised to find that the Deputy-licenser was not only a rigid Methodist himself, but had even built "a little tabernacle" of his own. He believed that "the more illiterate the preacher, the more infatuated was the flock." He thought there was less danger "in the specious insinuations of a refined mind than in the open and violent expressions of inspired tailors and illuminated cobblers." He describes the aim of his satire in these words: "I conceived, by blending the most flippant and ridiculous of all callings except a

<sup>1</sup> *Killing no Murder*, Pref., 8, 4.

man-milliner's (I mean a dancing-master's) with the grave and important character of a preacher, I should, without touching indelicately on the subject, have raised a laugh against the absurd union of spiritual and secular avocations which so decidedly marks the character of the Methodists."

On the other hand this spirit of hostility was not without certain provocations. The Methodists retorted bitterness for bitterness. Hook tells how Methodist children were brought up from their cradle to hate and dread the clergy of the Established Church, and says he has known a whole swarm of children driven off to bed by being told that the "bishop" was coming. Nor were more serious provocations wanting. At Rowland Hill's Chapel, Hook says (describing it in the manner of the times as "a sty of mud and corruption"), the congregation were congratulated from the pulpit on the destruction of Covent Garden Theatre; and the annihilation of a score of firemen was noticed as a singular proof of the wisdom of Providence in these words:—"Great news, my brethren, great news! A great triumph has taken place over the devil and the stage-players. A fire in one of their houses! O, may there be one consumed every year! It is my fervent prayer."

*Killing no Murder* was written especially for Mathews and Liston. The Deputy-lenscer did the author a good turn, as he was the first to acknowledge, by vetoing the play. Hook said that the refusal of the licence was as good as a dozen newspaper paragraphs to him; and when the farce was printed the public interest in the matter was so great that half a dozen editions were speedily exhausted.<sup>1</sup> Genest applauds Hook for his spirit in bringing the matter before the public, and advises all who are so treated to act in the same way. He also points out how much more amenable the censorship had become to public opinion—Mr. Larpent not having ventured to refuse his licence without giving a reason—and is inclined to credit Macklin's stout remonstrance with this improvement in the author's position.

For some years the drama enjoyed a period of comparative freedom at the hands of the Censor.

"So mild he sway'd the drama's pleas'd domains,  
That bards and actors hardly felt their chains."

But in 1824 Mr. Martin Archer Shee, "an artist of retired and studious habits," as he described himself, and a member of the Royal Academy (afterwards President), wrote a tragedy called *Alasco*. It was the result, he tells us, of one of those accidental impulses, "which so often and so strangely influence the characters and actions of men." Better had it been for Mr. Shee if he had never been visited by that impulse. His brief sojourn in "the dramatic

<sup>1</sup> *Life and Remains of T. E. Hook* (p. 22). By the Rev. R. H. Dalton Barham. London. 1849. Genest, viii. 149.

tenement" was destined to bring him a world of trouble. *Alasco* was accepted by Charles Kemble and put in rehearsal for Covent Garden. At the eleventh hour, *more suo*, the Licenser forbade its production, unless the author consented to a large number of excisions. The author did not consent, and, to use his own highly coloured expression, was "blotted out of theatrical existence in a flourish of red ink, convicted without trial, and condemned without appeal." To revenge himself on the Licenser he published his play with the condemned passages printed in italics for the public to form their own judgment, together with a preface of vindication.<sup>1</sup> He complained very feelingly of the dramatic author's time, talents, feelings, interests, and reputation being at the mercy of a personage distinguished by a designation no more important than that of "Examiner of Plays." He could conscientiously declare that no "pious divine" ever sat down to the preparation of his sermon with a more zealous desire to recommend the interests of religion and morality. He desired his composition to be a vehicle for the inculcation of every public and private virtue—a large weight for any respectable tragedy to carry! He had some theories on the drama, and a desire to see how far he was capable of putting them into effect had led him to amuse with his pen "those evening hours of relaxation which the labours of the pencil could not employ." With regard to the characters of the play he had wished to employ "as many virtuous agents as might be gracefully put in action through the five allotted portions of dramatic space." His patriot was a patriot of the old-fashioned type, "made up by the regular prescription approved in all ages." "He is no Jacobinical sprout from the luxuriant stem of diseased philosophy," says Sir Martin, anticipating some Tory leader-writers of to-day. His villain, too, was a good old-fashioned villain, who rejoiced in the appropriate name of "Malinski." His heroine, as a lady's due, had been treated tenderly by the Licenser, though in one or two places she had scandalized him by what Sir Martin, who is fond of alliteration, calls "interjectional indecorum." To place his loyalty beyond suspicion, he quotes from a copy of verses of his own, printed many years before in the *Sun*, which had been set to music and dedicated to the Prince Regent! And, to put the matter beyond all question, he declares that, if in his humble station he were authorized to approach the throne, he would without hesitation lay *Alasco* at the feet of his sovereign, as a testimony to the mild sway of a constitutional king, and as a tribute of his gratitude for the generous interest which his Majesty has never failed to take in the peace, the union, the prosperity of Sir Martin's native country! Sir Martin, however, will bear his reverse in a philosophical spirit. He is an artist, he has a

<sup>1</sup> *Alasco: A Tragedy in Five Acts.* By Martin Archer Shee, Esq. A. Excluded by the authority of the Lord Chamberlain. London. 1824.

retreat within his own province—"a claim of settlement in the parish of *virtù*." In art there is no censorship; the artist, says Sir Martin, with something epigrammatic in his tone, may paint the Saracen's head without being thought personal to the Grand Turk.

As probably not many persons now read *Alasco*, though it has received the honour of being included in a volume of *Living Plays*, it may be interesting to give a few of the passages that called forth the Reader's indignation, with Sir Martin's properly indignant comments. Here is a passage, to the ordinary eye, innocuous enough:—

"Now,  
Our private injuries yield to public wrong  
The avenging sword; we strike but for our country."<sup>1</sup>

As this passage, said Sir Martin, has been expunged with more than the ordinary rage of red ink, it is to be supposed that private vengeance is, in the estimation of our judicious censor, a nobler motive for drawing the sword than public wrong; and that when we strike it should be for ourselves and not for our country!!! Three marks of exclamation will only suffice to convey Sir Martin's sense of astonishment and disgust.

Another character said (before his remarks were erased):—

"Am I so lightly held—so low in estimate  
To brook dishonour from a knave in place!"<sup>2</sup>

It was only a natural conclusion on the part of Sir Martin that the Licensor by striking out these words had taken all "knaves in place" under his special patronage and extended to them his protection "against the saucy sarcasms of unplaced, unpensioned, and unprivileged bards." It is to be regretted, he adds, that this sapient person did not reign in the audacious days of *The Beggar's Opera*. With what a virtuous indignation he would have dashed his official quill through the following assault, on all that is moral, wise, good, and gracious in his estimation.

"Should you censure the age  
Be cautious and sage,  
Lest the courtiers offended should be;  
If you mention vice or bribe,  
'Tis so pat to all the tribe,  
Each cries, 'That was levelled at me!'"

On one page a number of expressions had been struck out, apparently on no fixed principle, while others no less objectionable had been allowed to stand. Upon this the poet calls attention to the discriminating taste with which the poison of patriotism is detected in seditious syllables, hemistiches, and half sentences—very strikingly illustrating the utility of a Censor of Plays!

<sup>1</sup> *Alasco*, p. 62.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 65.

In the following passage the Censor thought the sentiment was too strongly expressed :

"The cowards! Hell's hot blisters on the backs  
They turn so basely."

The poet, after observing that the Censor is evidently one of those scrupulous observers of decorum

"That would not mention hell to ears polite,"

suggests that he should employ the ample leisure his office affords him in giving the world an *editio expurgata* of our principal dramatists, "a Shakespeare refined according to the official standard of politics and politeness." All illustrations of passion, character, and situation used by the poets could then be ruthlessly swept away and no longer be a cause of offence. Sir Martin concludes his animadversions on the Licensor by observing, with some show of probability, that had the Licensor anticipated the possibility that an unhappy dramatist could have had the hardihood to rebel against his mandate, and lay open the nature and object of his operations, it is probable he would have been more on his guard.

Genest, whose tone is unfriendly to Sir Martin Shee, denies the accuracy of the statement on the title-page of *Alasco*, that it had been excluded from the stage by the authority of the Lord Chamberlain. The truth was that the Lord Chamberlain had made certain excisions the condition of its being produced, and, as Shee had not consented to those excisions, he was himself in a sense responsible for the exclusion of the play. Genest thinks, too, that there was room for excision in the matter of Shee's profuse and profane exclamations and interjections. But any impartial reader will see that interference with the text was carried to an absurd extent, and that the suppression of the most ordinary patriotic expressions reflected no credit either on the sense or humour of the Licensor and his deputy.

Perhaps the Licensor's power was never employed more unjustly than in the case of Mary Russell Mitford's tragedy of *Charles the First*. In a preface to the play, which was printed and acted nine years later, Miss Mitford relates the tale of this injustice in feeling terms. The subject of the play had been suggested by Macready; Charles Kemble had enforced the suggestion; neither, experienced judges as they were in theatrical matters, anticipating any objection. How should they, Miss Mitford naturally asks, when a tragedy with the same name and subject, by a Mr. Harvard, had been frequently acted in the past, with John Kemble in the leading part, and might be acted again at any moment? Mr. Colman, it appears, had no objection either to the details or to the execution—at least to Miss Mitford's

<sup>1</sup> *Alasco*, p. 114.

<sup>2</sup> Genest, x. 244.

<sup>3</sup> *Charles the First*, an Historical Tragedy, in Five Acts. By Mary Russell Mitford. London. 1834.

execution—of *Charles the First*. He founded his veto upon a general objection to the title and subject. The Duke of Montrose, Lord Chamberlain, confirmed his deputy's decision, and Miss Mitford's tragedy went to sleep for nine years in her desk until a new Lord Chamberlain arose, who was without scruples on the subject of *Charles the First*. The managers of the Victoria Theatre, to which Miss Mitford gratefully refers as "honourably distinguished in this age of opera and spectacle by its encouragement of the legitimate drama," undertook to produce the tragedy. The adroit compliments with which Miss Mitford bought off the opposition of the new Lord Chamberlain are as characteristic as they are charming. The whole theatrical world is indebted to him—herself in particular. No such case of injustice could happen under his administration. A characteristic delicacy might hinder him from rescinding his predecessor's decree, but he is "too eminent for liberality and kindness, too tasteful and enlightened a patron of the acted drama to be led by the fear of an imaginary danger into placing fetters and shackles on an art which he loves.<sup>1</sup> The worthy Deputy-lenser is dismissed with a few words of womanly sympathy and contempt. "His scruples" (poor slave of conscience) "could arise from no personal ill-will to the writer." That they were the offspring of "an honest timidity," "an over-zealous fear," is unquestionable. "A Licenser" (unhappy man) "must needs be somewhat of an alarmist in virtue of his office."

In 1866 a Select Committee was held to inquire into the whole subject of theatrical licences and regulations,<sup>2</sup> and in the course of the evidence a good deal of light was thrown on the working of the Lord Chamberlain's office. We may glance, in conclusion, at a few of the opinions offered. Shirley Brooks gave an instance from his own experience of the arbitrary nature of decisions. He had been persuaded by the Keeleys, who were at the time tenants of the Lyceum, to produce a dramatized version of Disraeli's *Coningsby*, then in its first vogue. Brooks did not quite see his way to dramatize the tale; but being, as he says, at the age when one is ready to undertake difficulties, almost impossibilities, he made the attempt; put in a fresh character or two, invented a few new scenes, and seemed to be in the way of a fair success. A "tolerably good *Coningsby*" was secured; there was a splendid scene of the Montem at Eton; and everything was nearly ready, when the author suddenly received information that the piece would not be allowed. The Lord Chamberlain proved very gracious, and himself went over the offending piece with the young writer. After a tenth or twelfth effort to surmount some of the small objections raised, Brooks was reduced to despair, and the Lord Chamberlain concluded the whole matter by blandly remarking: "You see that you are writing a kind of quasi-political

<sup>1</sup> *Charles the First*, Pref., 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Theatrical Licences and Regulations: Report of Select Committee*. 1866.

piece; and here you are exhibiting a sort of contrast between the manufacturing people and the lower classes. Do not you think now that would be a pity?" It was in vain that Brooks pleaded that his object had not been to set class against class, and that he had represented the upper class in a more favourable light than they had ever been represented before—the Lord Chamberlain only proceeded with his carpings and complaints. This was not to be in, and that was not to be in. Something might be construed into an illusion to a family in Shropshire. Mr. Holloway's ointment was not to be put in as Mr. Holloway's ointment, because, really, Mr. Holloway was an industrious tradesman, and employed a good many tradespeople; and so on. Shirley Brooks thought that a series of things of that kind placed a dramatic author in a very unfavourable position; and he not unnaturally felt, from his own experience, that the interference of the Lord Chamberlain was not always exercised in the true interest of the drama.

Mr. Boucicault and Mr. Hollingshead gave evidence to the same effect. Mr. Boucicault admitted that the then Reader, Mr. Donne, was the most liberal censor they had ever known, and that "his power was like the presence of a lady at a dinner-table of gentlemen to control in a delicate way the subjects spoken of." In spite of that, he considered that the Lord Chamberlain's power was exercised capriciously, and that it was not so searching a test as public opinion, because the Licensor often overlooked many things that the public does not overlook. He gave an instance from one of his own plays. In *Old Heads and Young Hearts*, produced at the Haymarket in 1844, there was a love scene at the end where the gentleman (played by Charles Mathews) had to say to the lady, "I came to scoff, but I remained to pray"—he being on his knees. "That expression out of Goldsmith," Mr. Boucicault said, "the audience mistook; they thought it came out of the Bible, and they hissed it." We may not agree with Mr. Boucicault's interpretation of the incident, but it certainly supported his contention that the public taste was more sensitive than that of the Lord Chamberlain's Reader. Mr. Hollingshead, whose views on the *liberté du théâtre* are well known, gave similar evidence. He held that the opinion of the Press was far more searching than the official scrutiny. He gave an instance of a drama, then playing at the Adelphi, taken from a very objectionable French piece with very little care in adapting it to "English ideas of right and wrong." It was offensive in action; it was full of vulgarities in dialogue; it ended with a parody of the judgment of Solomon; and it had a most objectionable Holywell Street title. That drama, said Mr. Hollingshead, had passed the censorship of the Lord Chamberlain, and would continue to be performed for a considerable time.

On this occasion the other side had an able advocate in the late

Mr. Charles Reade, who gave his evidence in defence of the censorship of plays. He could not agree with those who put a play on the same footing as a book. In his opinion there were two main distinctions. A play reproduces a story in flesh and blood; the realization is of a different kind; things might be described in a book which could not be presented in a play, and which could not be indicated without doing considerable harm. A second distinction was that a play does not, like a book, creep gradually into public notice. The theatre is thrown open to 2000 people at once, and it seemed a pity that some 20,000 or 30,000 people should have been spectators of an improper performance before anything could be done to remove what was seditious or wrong. He would not, however, give the Licensor too large a law. His decisions ought not to be arbitrary; his function should be confined to what is seditious and against good morals; there ought to be an appeal against his decision. In these words Mr. Reade probably expressed the views of the majority of sensible people on a difficult subject. The Lord Chamberlain's office may not be incapable of reform; injustice has certainly been done to dramatic authors in the past in many instances, and there appears to be only the weight of popular opinion to prevent a repetition of it. On the other hand, the public may look, and not unreasonably, for some such safeguard against obvious breaches of elementary taste and decorum as is at present supplied by the office of the Lord Chamberlain.



## THE TRIALS OF A NONCONFORMIST MINISTER.

THE republication of Dr. Jessopp's *Essays* on topics growing out of his clerical experiences in Norfolk, and especially of the very striking one on *The Trials of a Country Parson*, may fitly give rise to heart-searchings in other than beneficed breasts, for the ecclesiastical trouble of our day is very widespread—a fact which the so-called “Down-grade” controversy is just now illustrating in Dissenting circles very fully.

It seems that we were wrong in supposing that the accomplished Head Master of the Norwich Grammar School could sink into the comparative repose of a rural charge; the *otium cum dignitate* which we so readily associate with an East Anglian parsonage has no more charms for him than the solitude of Juan Fernandez had for Alexander Selkirk. This particular country parson finds life somewhat less worth the living amongst the Norfolk bucolics, and, as for the clerical brethren, “their tameness is shocking” indeed. Clearly, Dr. Jessopp is entitled to speak of himself (in the language of the lamenting Hebrew seer) as “a speckled bird” amongst the flock in these uplands; or, to hazard another ornithological and scriptural metaphor, he is the dove with silver wings who has “lain among the pots,” and risked much loss of brightness. However, he has the pen of a ready writer, and the lay sermons here printed will go farther than the preached word.

That rural life in general, and clerical service under rural conditions in particular, should not quite have fulfilled Dr. Jessopp's expectations, is not much to be wondered at, perhaps; for he has more of Pope than of Wordsworth in his mental make, and might be tempted to shrug his shoulders and murmur “humbug” if any admirer of the gentle Cowper (whose grave is in East Dereham) were to quote his “God made the country, man made the town,” in a serious way. Still, it is only fair to make full allowance for our clever and, on the whole, genial essayist, when he waxes scornful and moody by turns over the phenomena of village life and the decay of English gentility; for he is often led by his fine sympathies to identify himself with a class; so that he speaks, or writes, not solely from himself, but as they might, if they were not

(as he pathetically deplores) so deficient in the art of expression that their sorrows and failures are largely unheeded by the over-busy, self-occupied world.

That world is not so over-busy and self-occupied as to have no interest whatever in the condition of its spiritual guides, or those who are professionally designated such. Every now and then it wakes up and shows a lively desire to comprehend the drift of events in Church and State which is bearing its children to some unseen settlement in matters religious. The trouble is that no all-powerful voice commands their reverence; that they are thrown back continually upon their own sense of what is true and right, and have not yet developed much self-reliance in things spiritual. The controversies of the time have a bewildering tendency, and people mostly suspend their judgment upon a number of important matters about which their grandfathers had no doubts and hesitations; they content themselves with so-called practical aims, and easily admit the sceptical postulate that there is not a great deal to be known respecting transcendental things—that is, outside of their material interests and everyday occupations. Moreover, the standing dispute between the Church as by law established and the Churches which have at various times thrown off her control, does not get cleared up to the satisfaction of the ordinary British mind. "A plague on both your houses" is the verdict of quite a large proportion of the publicists who are badgered by the Liberation Society on the one hand and the Church Defence Association on the other. Somehow, they fancy that the truth is not committed exclusively to the keeping of either party; that the solution of the problem first attempted at the English Reformation, and experimented upon in many ways since, will ultimately be produced by deeper and less hasty thinkers than those who prattle about spiritual adultery, and apostolic succession on Sectarian and Anglican platforms to-day.

It is a long while since Mrs. Oliphant portrayed, in *Salem Chapel*, one of those provincial Dissenting circles which were a byword of Episcopalian scorn in the days when vulgarity, and the ignorance of which it is the sign, were supposed to belong exclusively to religionists outside the illuminated pale. Things have greatly changed since Sydney Smith's caustic estimate of Dissent was traditional in good society. Dickens did something, George Eliot has done more, perhaps, to weaken reliance on professional "shepherds," by illustrating their proneness to ordinary human frailties, and, in a corresponding degree, bringing into relief the preciousness of high gifts of instruction and consolation faithfully employed by those who possess them, though no outward unction has been invoked to stamp them with authority and single them out from the common life. If the Church of England ever had anything like a monopoly of manners and scholarship, she confessedly has it no longer. Dr. Jessopp is as

competent and voracious witness as a critic could desire; no more pungent an indictment of the seemingly haphazard and irremediable appointments of these latter days, in rural parishes at least, could be found—no, not in Dissenting diatribes uttered on Liberationist platforms, or in the most truculent organs of Secularism. Those whose lives have been passed in the great centres of population can easily find parallels to that state of things likewise; it is not East Anglia alone that suffers from the vagaries of clerical fledgelings, such as Mr. Jessopp describes, and priestesses of the Mrs. Moggs and Mrs. Connor types. Mr. Matthew Arnold's dearly cherished ideal of the Christian "gentleman in every parish" seems to be farther from realization than ever, as things are going. But if that be so, we have all some interest in the inquiry, "How far has Nonconformity occupied the ground of religious influence and supervision?" Granting that the parochial system has broken down considerably, is its rival fairly filling its place, improving upon its methods, doing something like equivalent service? Do the Churches called "Free" in distinction from the Established and (semi-Episcopal) Methodist Churches on the other hand, and the agencies their "freedom" naturally fosters, at all sufficiently supply the want created wherever the old organization has broken down, of which the rector, or the vicar, and his helpers in due subordination, were the mainstays and directors? It is to be feared that no very definite answer in the affirmative can be made by any impartial and well-informed witness. Hence the widespread unwillingness to push things to what may possibly be the logical conclusion from premisses very largely admitted in these days; hence also the indecision of Liberal leaders, who have less to deter them, in the way of training and sentimental attachment, than the statesman who typifies the genius of Constitutional and timely reform.

It is obvious that a man's outward experience gives a colour to his convictions on such matters, and therefore the writer of these lines feels bound to state that, though he is, and has been for twenty years and more, a Nonconformist minister, he was brought up in the Church of England, and educated for its ministry. Let none think that it was without a struggle, that it was without unfeigned reluctance and painful hesitancy, that the familiar fold was abandoned, that the instruction and example of pious foregoers in the ordered paths of liturgical and parochial religionism were thrust aside with levity, and new engagements speedily compensated for the loss of the old routine of difficult duty. Not so! Only a clear perception of the disharmony that was arising between one's views and outward professions in theological and ecclesiastical matters could have made possible a step that usually changes a man's environment at once and for a life-time. One learns by degrees to value the morally invigorating atmosphere of Nonconformity; but it is not so easy to

rest in it as the *summum bonum* of religious experience, as those do who call themselves "free-born"—like Mr. Spurgeon, and so many for whom he is entitled to speak. They find it, apparently, "their vital breath, their native air." Their watchword all along; the triumphant confession with which they enter Heaven, is, "The Dissidence of Dissent, and the Protestantism of the Protestant religion," by which they simply mean the universal prevalence of the "Evangelical" creed and the conventicle type of character and service.

Any worthy answer to the inquiry just propounded will, of course, take account of the changed and still changing social and political conditions of our time. It is obvious that, with a rapid development of a certain kind of equality, the need for a searching territorial oversight of the people's life becomes less manifest, its utility more questionable. As men and women gain access to the common sources of knowledge, they grow more independent; when they become better acquainted with their rights as human beings, and members of a constitutional society they are less inclined to lean upon semi-feudal props, or to confide in official mediators of any kind. But no temptation has happened to the Church of which Dr. Jessopp is a distinguished ornament, save such as is common to all Churches now. Authority is at a very serious discount amongst us. The franchise is widely extended in religious as well as in political spheres, is gradually being conceded to clamour where it has long been obstinately withheld. Though this does not imply an unmixed gain to the forces of light and moral sweetness which the man of faith perceives to be so widely operant in our modern life, it certainly carries with it the germs of much growth in the near future. The distinctively human qualities of wide sympathy, quick intelligence, interest in the spread of freedom and civilization, could not grow and thrive among the masses while they were kept in a state of tutelage. Hardly can they be said to have characterized selected individuals, like Cowper's aged peasant, who knew her Bible to be true, as the "brilliant Frenchman" did not, or like Legh Richmond's *Dairyman's Daughter*. Our foregoers, both Evangelical and Moderate, were apt to mistake a docile acquiescence in the doctrines and ritual of the Church or the Chapel for a satisfactory prevalence of the virtues that give solidity to a Christian profession. Now, there is much questioning of these things all round; orthodoxy of every type is discounted in the popular mind. It is a mistake to regard this increasing indifference to dogmatic claims as an evidence of decay in faith and morals; rather does it mark a new reformation within the limits of Church life, and a preparatory work of criticism without, signifying, in the order of development, the shaking of mutable things, social conventions which have had their day, and ecclesiastical arrangements which have served their turn—that the

things which cannot be shaken may remain," visible to every eye.  
For—

"The God that worketh high and wise,  
Nor pauseth in His plan,  
Will take the sun out of the skies  
Ere freedom out of man."

Yes! though all the tabernacles in England were to join in a common lament over unprosperous days.

Our Norfolk parson mourns the evident decadence of clerical influence in rural parishes, and attributes it largely to a falling off in solid learning, graciousness of character, and ability to play the part of a local providence amongst the poor and thriftless, who are disposed, now as aforetime, to cling to benefit of clergy. But, in various undesigned ways, this *censor morum* reveals his discontent with the ancient and still unrepealed canons of clerical procedure, with the clerical ideal, as it is usually set forth and embraced. Hardly can discerning readers of Dr. Jessopp's papers fail to conclude that a robust and well-furnished mind like his rises in strong revolt against the mechanical round of priestly functions, varied by the lightest of light social refreshments, which suffice to fill up the lives of so many of his brethren. All the dissatisfaction with the cramped conditions of an East Anglian parson's life implies a transformed environment, sure to be uncongenial to one whose views and habits have been formed on other models than any that are current in rural circles. Lovers of Izaak Walton will recall his account of Dr. Donne's reluctance to take holy orders, and the reasons therefor. It is one thing to study the novel phases of country life from an antiquarian or dilettante point of view; it is quite another to settle down to the laborious and sadly unappreciated task of helping all sorts and conditions of men, and women, and children, to shape their characters and conduct by the Christian law. Our late Chelsea sage had the power to see, and to make others see, the picturesque sublimity of Abbot Samson's life-work at St. Edmundsbury; but who that knew the ethico-historical artist himself would have expected him to emulate that mediæval worthy, if called to fill a prebendal stall in these latter days! His *Trials* would have been manifold and poignant, no doubt

last reflection lands us on the brink of the parallel difficulty we have undertaken to touch upon—"The Trials of a Nonconformist Minister." Judging by the hasty utterances of the more inconsiderate amongst the advocates of Disestablishment, one would suppose that the injustice entailed by the Nonconformist life and attitude constituted in itself the most grievous of all injuries, the most unforgivable of all wrongs. Well; that is as it may be. Some men stand in more need of artificial support than others. To some teachers, the pedestal upon which they stand is almost everything; to

others it matters little. Again, the social recognition, which sterling intellectual and moral qualities, backed by genial and dignified manners, will easily win for their possessors in most English circles, urban or provincial, rarely falls to the lot of those who habitually "set their backs up," and pose as martyrs in a persecuted cause. It is not by any means to be denied that *there are* social and other related drawbacks in the Nonconformist stand, however calmly it may be maintained—snobbery and the prejudice which is born of unfair privilege may still be found in circles from which one would expect them to have been banished by this time. Yet it is only where an acute sensitiveness does duty for more solid qualities of heart and head that the pressure of social convention becomes at all unbearable. The compensations, too, are many; if certain circles are closed to the Nonconformist minister, other and larger circles are thrown open. The democratic movement welcomes the aid of all who are unpledged to the maintenance of the existing order. The wide influence wielded by the more able and eloquent of those whose vocation excludes them from the "national" pulpits, and, along with that exclusion, gives unique validity to their message in the vulgar ear, may surely be set over against any inconvenience or slight to which at times they may be liable. No! the "trials" of the Nonconformist ministry are not chiefly those which arise from their inferior status—"equality" is more widely diffused than, in our partisan speeches, we are disposed to admit. However true it may be that the secularization of religion by its alliance with the State has done grievous harm and injustice to the claims of spiritual truth upon the individual, and that it must be held responsible for many falsities and abuses; however true that it is the ultimate ground of social exclusiveness in its varied and variously ugly forms, the fact remains that it but adds one to the many phases of discipline through which character is here ordained to pass. The weak and irresolute often succumb, or ignobly wring their hands over the loss of coveted ease and comfort; the strong and faithful climb on stepping-stones of dead custom to higher things.

The late James Baldwin Brown, a cultured and chivalrous London pastor, commenced a lecture on "Religious Equality in the Light of History" with these words—"I think that we Nonconformists have at last reached the borders of our Canaan. After ages of weary wandering, the promised land of religious liberty, equality, and brotherhood is in sight." Well, we may accept the analogy here implied, and still the case is not fundamentally changed. "Trials" grow out of evils that are largely chronic in our life, which, indeed, have almost grown hereditary. Science shows us, and so does religious philosophy, that effects outlive their apparent causes; and the historic ground of Nonconformity cannot be stubbed like Thornaby Waste, and then made to yield grapes of Eshcol. Promised lands

are apt to turn out ~~stones~~ of new probation; stones of stumbling and harassing foes abound there as they did in the wilderness. Always, when a long conflict for privilege withheld comes to an end, the coveted boon turns out to be less precious than it seemed to be in the far, far distance of man's desire. It will be so with the boon of Religious Equality. That is no reason why we should not stretch out our hands for it, certainly; but it is a reason for not exaggerating its importance in the scale of truths that wait the general recognition. The State is a clumsy manager of a "national" religious provision, for it has no discriminative gifts or adequate machinery for the discharge of so high a function. This grows ever more patent to the ordinary capacity, as it has long been clear to men of insight. But then, where is the corporation that does possess the altogether appropriate organization for administering spiritual light, strength, and consolation to the people at large in these days? Let us be faithful all round in so momentous a matter. We know on what grounds of prescriptive right and practical achievement the Mediæval Church rested her claim; and we can now make an approach towards a balanced estimate of the love of settled order on the one hand, and of free growth on the other, which gave birth to the dominant Episcopacy and the Dissenting systems in our own country, destined to spread and take new forms in the great Western World. What the sensible Englishman wants to know is, how far the necessities of these days survive in these, and whether modifications of both are not demanded by the changed conditions of the time?

When the present writer was first ordained pastor of a Nonconformist congregation, he tried very earnestly to transfer his inborn reverence for "the Church," its sacraments and its ordinances, to the community into which he had been hospitably received. Only very gradually was it made clear to him that supernatural purity was as little the heritage of voluntarism as of a State-controlled Church—that the confederated assemblies of the Congregational polity are local aggregations of average men and women, more or less consistently Christian in their own sense of the term, a sense which is narrower or more broadly intelligent according as they have drunk in the teachings of the higher literature and philosophy of our time, or shared the voluntary or inevitable ignorance of the uninquiring majority of hearers and worshippers. The preacher prays in the assembly, and the prayer-leaders in the more social gatherings, for Divine light and guidance; if they are wont to act as men do in all the practical affairs of life, going to the real sources of knowledge, and shaping their course in conformity with fact and law, they grow in character and in spiritual apprehension—if not, *not*. Hence arises one of the fieriest of the "trials" through which the Nonconformist minister is called to pass. Just in proportion to his own personal growth may be the inability of some who nominally share

the responsibilities of leadership to sanction his teachings amongst the people. It is an old trouble; he cannot pretend to be singled out for martyrdom; in all ages teacher and taught have found it hard to keep together. The priest succeeds in making an effective compromise, by means of symbols and ceremonies which accommodate themselves to ascending grades of religious intelligence and sensibility; the prophet presses on to higher levels of truth and experience. The Nonconformist has to reconcile the present need and the call to go forward as best he can. If he be at all sensitive, fairly cultured, and active in his thinking, anxious to make full proof of his opportunity, he will not escape this sore trouble, which may even deepen to dismay, and drive him from a calling which sometimes appears to be incompatible with the finest developments of character and real piety.

In illustration thereof it would be easy to adduce some of the proofs, every week more abundant, contained in the articles and correspondence of certain widely circulated religious organs—notably the *Christian World*, which has long directed the Nonconformist advance towards “liberal views” and novel experiments in Church life. Opinions that would have shocked the Congregationalists of twenty-five years ago, when the *Essays and Reviews* and Bishop Colenso’s Pentateuchal heresies were rousing much alarm and indignation, now “go down” with an ever-increasing number of readers. Mr. Spurgeon says that the Free Churches are “riddled through and through with Socinianism.” We suspect our last eminent Calvinist has but a hazy notion as to what “Socinianism” may be; but, if he employs the term as a synonym for modern Unitarianism and Broad-Churchism, he is probably not far from the truth. Only it must be noted that this changing attitude toward the problems of life, death, and eternity only implies a superficial, secondhand acquaintance with the new theology on the part of the people, though it carries with it much esoteric knowledge and research on the part of their abler and more studious preachers and writers. The Nonconformist colleges feel the rising tide acutely; and something very like a revolt of the students was lately occasioned in one of them by an attempt to suppress heretical teaching.

It is gratifying to minds that are in sympathy with the “liberal” movement in theology to see the avidity with which teachings like Archdeacon Farrar’s on *The Larger Hope*, and the late Henry Ward Beecher’s on *Religious Evolution*, are drunk in by thousands who have had no training for such inquiries except the discipline of the Dissenting home circle. Unquestionably, the harshness and rigidity of the older Nonconformist creeds have been modified very widely. It may be said that, *negatively*, the improvement has been great; the horrors of orthodox denunciation are now banished to obscure corners, where curious survivals excite the wonder of women and the contempt



of men; but, *positively*, the result is hardly so satisfactory. It is easier to disenchant the sects of their more revolting dogmas than to tempt them into the green pastures of religious contemplation, where fairer experiences may be gained. The "trials" of really "able ministers of the new covenant," who are endeavouring to make a safe highway from the Nonconformity of "the letter" to the more spiritual beliefs and ethics which are warranted by the mature religious consciousness of to-day, are no less real, though, it may be, less pitiable, than those through which Norfolk country parsons have to pass. The more prominent and outwardly successful, especially those whose brilliant gifts secure them large city congregations, have to run many risks, and sometimes resort to evasions and concealments, which must sorely exercise their consciences, for, however willing the people may be to have the new views dispensed from the pulpit, the elders of the synagogues expect them to accommodate truth to the average pew-holding apprehension; obsolete sectarian dogma must not be openly supplanted by verifiable doctrine, bearing its historic or philosophic label—it must be hidden away like leaven, or, to vary the figure, the "new wine" must be cautiously poured into the "old bottles." Some pulpiteers do this to perfection; a much larger number, not inferior to them in the more solid gifts and graces, but only in rhetorical cleverness, have to contend with a growing difficulty, one which arises out of the people's unpreparedness and the changed conditions in the midst of which the work of the ministry is carried on. They shrink from duplicity in sacred things; they expect little good to come of "handling the word of God deceitfully;" they cannot revive the tactics of the Sophists, or adapt the method of the Schoolmen: choosing the harder path of veracious exposition, they have to pay the penalty and endure divers trials. "The occasional timidity and weakness of St. Peter," says Dr. Lightfoot (*Galatians*, p. 339), "will be judged most harshly by those who have never themselves felt the agony of a great moral crisis, when not only their own ease and comfort, which is a small thing; but the spiritual welfare of others seems to clamour for a surrender of their principles." More than one member of the bench of bishops may shelter himself under this plea, no doubt; but the world will go on calling it "dissimulation" (as Paul did in his roughly-honest way) when a "pillar" of the Church, or of a rival sect, swallows his professions along with the emoluments attached to them, and goes on "daubing the wall with untempered mortar." Nonconformist deacons are probably neither better nor worse than Anglican churchwardens; and the neophytes and tyros who "supply" congregational pulpits in the absence of their pastors are at least as well equipped for the task as the young gentlemen in "M.B." waistcoats and (appropriately) soft hats, over whose blandly childlike omniscience Dr. Jessopp makes such a piteous wall. All the same, the Nonconformist minister of parts and progressive tendencies is pretty sure to

have his thorn in the flesh in the shape of some vigilant official, who smells heresy as a hound smells game; or some "messenger of Satan," who esteems it his special vocation to buffet him and keep him humble. The more thoughtful he is, and the more imaginatively susceptible, owing to his constant handling of spiritual truth which conditions the flow of high feelings, so much the heavier are his trials, the bitterer his disappointments. He is called to tread a sacrificial path; at best he will just get through, at worst he will have to mourn over prospects blighted and hope endlessly deferred. Many Church members are weak as well as pious, and because they are weak they are apt to sanction heedless cruelty. They change their minds quickly—cry "Hosanna" to-day, and "Away with Him" to-morrow. As to the commercial side of this subject (for, of course, it has such a side), it would be easy to match the privations of country parsons, and even starving curates, from Nonconformist annals and current reports. Dr. Allon recently gave some heartrending particulars of ministerial poverty. "A minister had written stating that the deacons had handed him 8s. 6d. as all that remained of a quarter's income of £18, after paying other expenses in connection with the chapel. Another unfortunate man had asked for assistance, his stipend being only £35 a year; another, who had a wife and three children, had £90 a year, and one or two more had £70 a year each."

The *Christian World* reports the condition of the Congregational Churches of Dorsetshire (Baptist and Pædo-Baptist) as "desperate." All over the land the problem of Church maintenance is an anxious one; in the rural districts it is the crux of the whole matter. Every sect sets up its own tabernacle, and competes with the rest for the wherewithal to live. Over-building retards the genuine work of evangelising, not to speak of the quieter means of religious growth. Tithes have a trick of shrinking and growing unreliable, says Dr. Jessopp; so have pew-rents and chapel subscriptions. We are not comparing the moral claim in the two cases; we are noting the actual fact, as distinguished from theory, sound or unsound. The disposition to drive a hard bargain with the parson is, one sometimes thinks, a growing British infirmity; and it contrasts painfully with the honour and profit reaped by competent religious instructors in Republican America. Does it spring from growing indifference to religious ordinances, or from the diffusion of men's interest over a much wider field of philanthropy and the too keen competition of our age? Perhaps from both causes; perhaps, also, because the Churches have slipped behind in point of intelligence and vigour, as compared with the more rapid general advance in the world. For men will pay for a thing they value; in the long run, and in spite of imperfect machinery for the training out of their spiritual powers, they will rescue their highest institutions from decay, and put them on a sound and prosperous footing. At present they are confused as

to where their religious treasure lies; they see a great overturning going on, and they only feebly grasp its inner significance. When the hurly-burly is over they will resettle their Churches, and the ministries by which alone they can be maintained in vigour and usefulness, on firmer foundations than either the State-controlled or the independent congregations of to-day can boast.

A very curious result of Dr. Jessopp's Norfolk experience, and one which comes with quite refreshing force and unction from his graceful pen, is the complaint of *finality*, as the sad heritage of the parson who has accepted a cure of souls in that East Anglia which our scholarly essayist finds so dreary—where murderers have been nourished, but sweet poesy has hardly marked any one for her own. The absence of this same *finality* has often been made a matter of reproach to Nonconformists, by those who believe, above all things else, in a Church by law established. Over and over again the fickleness of human nature, admittedly more trying in religion than in most things, has been urged as a reason why the ordinances and materialities of worship should be entrusted to higher and more dispassionate hands than those of the vulgar. What floods of holy rhetoric have been evoked by "the parson's freehold!" And now it turns out that what we have been provoked to jealousy about was only a barren sort of moor, and not by any means the fruitful vineyard for which so many desponding sectaries, downcast in view of the too-probably impending notice to quit which they saw reflected in an angry deacon's eyes, have sighed and sighed for in vain. It seems that this much vaunted and widely coveted "*finality*" is to be dreaded as a doom, and not welcomed as a clerical salvation; that it closes the door of hope upon the unhappy recipient of so questionable a sphere, shutting him up in uncongenial and unimprovable surroundings, to wear out life, like Silvio Pellico or Baron Trenck, in honourable but well-nigh intolerable misery. Fresh illustrations urge home the truism—

"Stone walls do not a prison make,  
Nor iron bars a cage."

No, indeed! there are worse confinements than those to which tyrants remand their victims; a Norfolk living is the iron shroud reserved for ex-fellows of colleges and university lecturers who have sinfully craved the repose of a country parish. *Verb. sap.*: Let threatened ones beware in time.

Seriously, though, our candid Doctor's critique of the pure unreason which appears to him to inspire the powers that be in their control of Church temperalities, falls short, in its erection of a standard, social and intellectual, which is too exacting for the circumstances. After all, the law of supply and demand rules in these high matters; and, anyhow or other, holy orders do not tempt so many of the ablest men in these days. Truth compels the admission that Non-

conformity is similarly affected. The ~~academic~~ ~~power~~ is vastly more costly than it was in the days of Dr. Doddridge and of Dr. John Taylor; also the scheme of training is wider; yet one cannot but wish that it would evoke gifts and enthusiasm equivalent to the old ones. Too often, as one listens to the theological fledgelings who graduate therein, one murmurs poor Selkirk's lament about the boobies that feared not man—"their tameness is shocking to me." The Nonconformist pastorate is now accessible cheaply to all grades, and the lower threaten to swamp the higher. There are some things which no college can give—things that go before it, and fling their lights or shadows over it. Of all the perplexed questions that are now to the front, this is the *most* perplexed. Liturgy or free prayer, pew-rents or offertory, read sermons or extempore ones, long services or short, ornate ones or plain—all fade into insignificance compared with the need for gifted and devoted men, who espouse the sacred work because they hear the secret call, and not because it solves the problem of living in a genteel and not over-laborious way. A considerable percentage of the ordained ministers in Congregational churches, whether more or less orthodox, fail to keep their foot-hold—some dropping into journalistic and scholastic occupations, some into business, and some floating from one casual preaching engagement to another. Life-long pastorates are very rare now, the majority average about four years. The most acute estimate of the situation in Nonconformist circles to-day may be gathered from a paper on "The Organization of the Liberal Churches," which lately appeared in the *Enquirer*. The writer declares that "under the present system young men should not be admitted into our colleges and ministry except under a vow of celibacy for twenty years." It is not purely a question of maintenance, though; insufficient stipends are symptomatic of a deeper trouble. Congregations find it desirable to change their preachers frequently; "new brooms sweep clean." "This call for novelty, human nature being what it is, is discreditable neither to minister nor people. No religious teacher has a mind of unlimited productive power. Very few hearers can be expected to satisfy themselves indefinitely from the same source of edification. The more individual the flavour of a preacher's mind, the more piquant and attractive the relish first given by his ministry, the sooner his peculiarity is likely to be recognized and to produce the effect of sameness. The themes of the preacher are high and profoundly important; but the note of piety runs through them all, and gives to them a certain uniformity and monotony. He that preaches twice a Sunday, moreover, produces matter in an abundance such as would make an excessively prolific historian, almost a prolific novelist, and does this in addition to public and pastoral duties of the most diverse and fatiguing nature."

There is material for reflection here, indeed! Methodism relies on its itinerancy to correct the overbalance of individualism, but the problem can hardly be said to be solved in that quarter; besides, the less rigidly dogmatic Churches of the Congregational type bow to no central authority like the almost despotic Conference. In the absence of a mutually helpful system of a more elastic kind, the smaller and more isolated communities suffer in their increase and prosperity much, in their moral and intellectual growth still more. The share of inconvenience falling to the lot of the faithful minister is apt to be disproportionately heavy. Faction hurts him, whatever be its outcome. Failure to embrace high opportunity, and unworthy conduct, shielding itself under the pretence of constitutional procedure, make his most strenuous and self-denying exertions in the cause of truth and righteousness of none effect. He is only a man, and fallible; he may not always speak and act wisely; but the punishment is often far in excess of the occasion, and it falls not on him and his alone—often it scatters the people, wastes much spiritual energy stored at great cost, and closes a door of usefulness in a town for years. There are cases wherein all the world can see that some man's transient whim, or the false taste of some wretched coterie, has sufficed to choke up a fountain of religious strength and refreshment in this way; judicious observers always wondering that no middle point could be found between an amorphous aggregation of people in practically unrelated communities, affording great scope to selfishness, while hardly responding to public opinion in its highest forms, and the hide-bound sectarianism which pretends to say and believe the same thing through all its grades and developments. But surely, it is not creditable to the freedom and fellowship the Nonconformist Churches profess to conserve, that so little effective brotherhood should be its outcome. The future of the movement for which Nonconformity and the right of private judgment stand sponsors depends upon the solution found for this pressing problem. No theoretic justification of Independency will suffice; "by their fruits ye shall know them" is in all mouths to-day. As for the advanced guard of that movement, its foes may rejoice, as its friends may mourn, over the fate foreshadowed for it by the writer already quoted:—

"We shall have loved light, but have distrusted that organic union which is the condition everywhere of effective and enduring life, and shall crumble away very soon, as everything does which has no vital principle of cohesion. The gospel of reason and reverence will not pass away, but it would have been better for the world if a religious body such as ours, which has made so many sacrifices in order that that gospel might be proclaimed without equivocation, or any dishonourable compromise with incredible creeds, could have survived to act as its prophet."

Let us try, in a few closing words, to gather up the main threads of our subject: other and wiser pens must indicate remedial processes such as the time and Nonconformist needs loudly demand. First, there are "trials," which, being common to many, even persons can hardly plead exemption from. Such, in the main, are those over which our East Anglian censor grieves. The depletion of country society; the loss of tone occasioned by crudely democratic invasions of the profession once so closely preserved for younger sons of the gentry; the ghastly mockery of semi-feudal ranks and orders which no longer show any veritable *raison d'être*, but misrepresent the real conditions and exigencies of English life; the diminishing significance of symbolic and formal distinctions in the popular mind—these and such like things make the path thorny for those who expect much from their ecclesiastical environment, little from their own souls and self-devotion. The present age has heard of good many Cassandra-like warnings from estimable but not far-sighted men, who forget that

"The old order changes, yielding place to new,  
And God fulfils Himself in many ways,  
Lest one good custom should corrupt the world."

In the same category must be placed those "trials" which pertain to the Christian ministry everywhere nowadays, because the Zeit-Geist is touching all men's experience, and creating new and only half-understood desires for reality in living and sincerity in speech. Churches cannot ignore the law which dooms unfit structures to decay; new life climbs up, not without pain and struggle, to new forms. How many of the finest lives have had their music wrung out of them by the pressure of circumstances! The late Dean Stanley, and F. W. Robertson, and T. T. Lynch, and many more within the pale, to say nothing of the long roll of faithful confessors who have had to deny themselves by remaining in the outer court—these all died in faith, not having received the promise, their zeal being according to knowledge, and so letting them in for much conflict with the rulers of the world's darkness. The vocation involves mediatorial suffering; the strong and finely gifted must bear the infirmities of the coarse and the weak. A man had better follow any honest trade than enter the ministry now without counting the cost.

Secondly, there would appear to be remediable "trials" in the ministerial life, obstacles due to the survivals of useless customs, warped machinery, and indolent prejudice amongst the "Free" Churches, as well as within the "Established" pale. We anticipate Disestablishment as one of the inevitable shocks to which our cumbersome English constitution is heir; but who can fail to see that there is a rising demand for great modifications of Dissenting usage, to

meet the changed attitude of the masses toward religious institutions? Something has been done in this direction of late, but far more remains to be done. Belief will largely condition pious association in the future, as it has done in the past, no doubt; but the unintelligent echo of some one else's theological speculation will not henceforth pass current as faith. The shoe of hard dogmatic profession pinches sorely; the world's toilers ask new questions, and cherish more practical aims. The Churches must respect the natures they have to work upon; preachers will have to teach by example, to show the people *how* to think, and not merely *what* to think. Faith is not dead amongst the common folk; it is only suspended on certain points till the preachers have found their real bearings. "The preachers!" Yes—for after all the day of preaching is not past, and will not be, until the impulse to social worship perishes out of people's life. The age still needs true preachers. A significant correspondence in the *Christian World*, on "Pretence in the Pulpit," discloses the fact that many ministers dress in borrowed plumes, deliver other men's sermons without acknowledgment. One clerical "conveyer" of thoughts and appeals, superior to any of his own, openly defends and tries to justify the practice. No doubt the temptation to this sort of thing is great where men of no great original faculty are expected to furnish two or even more discourses every week, and that in addition to the multifarious duties of the pastorate. The remedy for "trials" thence arising is twofold: the Churches must modify their exacting system, preferring quality to quantity, and the gate into the ministry must be made straiter; college examiners and others charged with so delicate and responsible a duty must resolve to "lay hands suddenly on no man," must reject weak candidates, and charge them to enter some other calling, "to work with their hands the thing that is good, rather than work with their heads the thing that is 'goody.'"

Thousands will assemble to hear a *live* teacher even yet, though it must be granted that they prefer an "unconsecrated" place; until the Churches find out and remedy the causes of this preference, the stronger and finer amongst their ministers will have to seek them on their own ground, and endure "trials" in the exercise of a vocation which may be Christ-like, but is not "what he was engaged for" by the sect to which he nominally belongs. There is a humorous side to that same "engagement," and the following (American) anecdote hits it off:—

"A minister had been invited to fill a vacant pulpit. He was the guest of a leading member; and his host said he hoped he would avoid saying anything in his sermon to offend the Spiritualists, as there were many in the town who attended their church. Walking down the street, another leading light of the Church was met, who hoped he would not say anything to offend the Universalists, as

many of them attended their church. Just as he was entering the pulpit, one of the deacons button-holed him, and said, "The largest liquor dealer in town is here in his pew; I hope you will not find it necessary to refer to that business." The perplexed minister then inquired, "What shall I preach about?" "Oh!" said the deacon, "give it to the Jews, they haven't got a friend in town."

But let us not end this matter with a *jeu d'esprit*. The times are serious; it behoves all who have insight and opportunity to throw what light they can on the social and religious problems of the day, remembering that we may make the irresistible law of progress our friend by timely adaptation of means to ends, while evasive timidity only stores up wrath against some day of wrath. The world seems to be going out afresh, "Behold, I make all things new!"\* To that requirement even Nonconformists must conform: "Let us, for very shame," said Baldwin Brown, "have done with the lofty tone of superiority which we are so fond of assuming toward creed-bound Churches. We are ourselves more miserably bound than any of them." That may have been an unwise utterance for an anti-State Churchman to make; we know it was an honest and earnest one, and one to which thousands respond in their troubled hearts. An age that makes no account of "little systems," that

"deepens now a grave  
Where every king and every slave  
Shall drop in crown and chain,  
Till only man remain"—

is not likely to pause when certain adjustments have been made in Church and State, accepting some "logical" alternative ready made for it; it will press on to fresh woods and pastures new, where the needs of men's hearts and lives may be fully met. The prophetic soul of the world, dreaming of things to come, anticipates that day, and says to strait-laced Churches of every kind, "Cast away your bonds, and get ready; for only as ye grow towards the measures of this quickly evolving time, can ye hope to flourish, or even to abide."



## WORK AND WOMEN.

ARE Trades Unions among women practicable, and how far may they be relied upon to ameliorate the condition of the underpaid female worker? In June last was made a first effort by women in London to raise wages by combination, when some twelve hundred girls struck at Messrs. Bryant & May's match factory, and, contrary to expectations, were successful. Most people agreed that the strike was a righteous one, but how far the precedent can be successfully followed is a doubtful question; though there are many who expect trades unionism to work as effectively among women as among men, and who hope that this first successful strike will be the precursor of others by women in other trades. A "Women's Provident and Protective League" exists, founded by the late Mrs. Paterson, and now energetically worked by Miss Clementina Black, but hitherto its operations have not been extensive; for combination among women is far more difficult of achievement than among men, and we now propose to consider some of the difficulties by which the subject is surrounded.

Of late years much has been said and written on the subject of women in the labour market, and also of women in the political world; and these two questions have been, as it seems to us, very improperly confused. The right of women to exercise their full intelligence in every direction, and to assert their choice in the makers of laws to which they, as well as men, are subject, has been spoken of and regarded as part of the question of the expediency of women's entering the various professions and trades in which, hitherto, men only have been breadwinners; and one curious result of this confusion is, that, if the attitude of the Women's Rights party be examined, it will be found that by "women" is generally meant "spinster," to the determined exclusion of the majority of the sex during the most important period of their existence—that of wifehood and motherhood.

The present Bills for the enfranchisement of women are an illustration of this fact, being for the enfranchisement of widows and spinsters only, and appear to us to be a curious anomaly. For, on the property qualification, the franchise should surely not be denied to wives, since marriage no longer deprives woman of her possessions; and if the vote is allowed on what may be termed the moral or

intellectual qualification, surely no one will deny that the married woman, the mother of the next generation, who, through her offspring, largely influences the future of the State, is a more important moral factor in society than the spinster, whose virtues or vices terminate with herself; nor can it be asserted that a wife and mother, with her widened experiences and enlarged sympathies, is less fit than her single sister to use her judgment in choosing the makers of laws, many of which only affect those who are themselves mothers and wives.

But in considering the utterances of any of the more extreme leaders of the party, it will be found that it is the single woman, and not the wife, whom they have in mind as the important unit. We remember on one occasion hearing a highly educated lady, an M.D., who would have been expected to have studied her subject and to speak with accuracy, state that to the fact of there being nearly a million more women than men in the United Kingdom we owe the many reforms and good works due to female effort, for, this huge number having found marriage an impossibility, have been obliged to turn their attention in other directions, hence the useful works and social improvements due to women's exertions. We do not think that a more unworthy and undignified position with reference to women's endeavours to help their fellow creatures could have been assumed; and we protest against the proposition that women's right to exercise to the full their intellects, and to take their share in the regulation of their country, can be affected by the question of the number who may be compelled to stand alone in the world or to live by their own work. Woman's right to an absolute equality with man in all matters settled by human regulation rests on higher grounds, is inalienable from her right to exist as a human being, and would remain the same were there only twenty women left in the country amidst a male population of millions.

But the statement that marriage is impossible to such a large proportion of women through scarcity of men has been repeated again and again as an argument in favour of opening to women all the professions and trades hitherto pursued by men only. To many estimable persons the "surplus female population" has been a veritable nightmare, and at its door have been laid some of the gravest evils of modern society. A little study of the census papers would have shown that the enormous preponderance of spinsters has been curiously exaggerated, and that the number of women to whom the position of wife is rendered impossible through deficiency of men is small; for we find that, according to the last census, there were in the United Kingdom 4,419,133 adult single men, and 4,484,180 adult single women, the latter being only 65,017 in excess of the former, a number which, in a population of over thirty-five millions, may fairly be regarded as insignificant. And, furthermore,

we find that, between the ages of fifteen and forty-five, the single women are absolutely in the minority,<sup>1</sup> for the bachelors number 4,101,014, and the spinsters only 4,022,118, an excess of 78,896 men.<sup>2</sup>

No one, on behalf of women, need be seriously alarmed at these figures; neither in them can be found a reason for the greatly overstocked state of the market for female labour. The reason is farther to seek, and a glance at the third column of the returns reveals a fact which throws much light on the question. We find that the widows number as many as 1,410,684, and the widowers 589,644, being an excess of 821,040 women. And herein, we believe, lies the real crux of the question. It is not the spinsters who constitute the surplus female population, and by whom the labour market is flooded, but the widows. The cause of this great excess is to be found both in the greater natural longevity of women, and in the many risks to life to which men of all classes are exposed.

Any one working among the London poor must have felt something akin to despair at the apparently unending stream of applications from widows needing assistance, for, of all our helpless nineteenth century population, the widow of the working man is perhaps the most hopeless and unhelpable. Before her marriage she may have been to work in a factory or workshop, or perhaps was a member of that mighty army of domestic servants, which in England and Wales alone numbers over a million. If this last, she is even more helpless than if she had worked at a trade. Perhaps she has lived in the house of affluent people, an education in itself ill,

<sup>1</sup> We give the full tables of the conjugal condition of the people of the United Kingdom above 15 years of age (see *Report of the Census of Scotland*, p. 36, table 84):—

	Total of Adults above 15.	Single.	Married.	Widowed.
Scotland—				
Males . . .	1,107,519	500,757	547,772	58,990
Females . . .	1,262,448	543,271	560,630	158,547
England and Wales—				
Males . . .	7,911,436	3,099,744	4,376,898	434,794
Females . . .	8,594,412	3,157,404	4,437,962	999,046
Males . . .	1,611,034 ...	818,632 ...	696,542 ...	95,860
Females . . .	1,749,091 ...	783,475 ...	712,525 ...	253,091

<sup>2</sup> The following are the numbers of the population, with conjugal conditions between the ages of 15 and 45 (see same tables):—

	Single.	Married.	Widowed.
Scotland—			
Males . . .	463,831 ...	318,712 ...	11,425
Females . . .	464,931 ...	369,442 ...	27,523
England and Wales—			
Males . . .	2,899,489 ...	2,639,819 ...	80,747
Females . . .	2,865,253 ...	2,943,186 ...	181,178
Ireland—			
Males . . .	737,694 ...	315,542 ...	11,509
Females . . .	691,984 ...	432,298 ...	39,833

These tables do not include the population of the Channel Islands or Isle of Man, nor the Army, Navy, or merchant seamen abroad, who numbered in 1881 215,374, and would, of course, add to the male excess.

adapted to promote thrift in a poor man's wife. A domestic servant's wages (unless in very large households) are not sufficient to allow of much saving; for personal tidiness is essential, and work speedily wears out clothes; so when the girl marries, all she has laid by is most probably invested in furniture, &c. As a rule, working people save nothing, and if a family springs up, nothing will be laid aside from the weekly income of £1 10s. or £2 a week beyond the man's payments into some club or benefit society. All depends on the man's life and health, and when he dies the wife is left entirely to her own exertions. If there has been a protracted illness before death poverty will have already set in, and the sum received from the club will do little more than help the widow to pay her debts. Some of her children she may send into the district schools, their maintenance there adding to the burdens of the already over-burdened ratepayer; and then she must face the problem of how to support herself and the children who remain with her. She will probably try to get office-cleaning or charring, but the market for both is overstocked, and the obtaining of such work depends almost entirely on her having influential friends. In this condition she falls an easy prey to the "sweater." Some other woman who is making fancy shoe rosettes at sixpence a dozen, or sewing bags together at a shilling a hundred, finishing trousers at three-halfpence a pair, or sewing up umbrella covers at fivepence a dozen, offers to get work for her at the same rate, and in her despair she takes it, adding to the crowd who reduce women's wages to their present starvation point. She believes that it is better to have underpaid work at home, than to take occupation which shall separate her from her children. She is content to get on as she can, in the hope and belief that this is only a temporary state of things, to endure till her children are grown up, and relieve her of the burden of supporting herself and them. To persuade such a woman to combine with others, or to make her appreciate the advantages of union, would be almost impossible. She is past her first youth, and has lost heart and hope. She does not realize how many are placed in a similar situation. Her feeling is that her lot is exceptional, and very hard indeed it would be to inspire her with the sense of comradeship and courage necessary for a strike. Among the working women of London the home worker is certainly the worst paid, and her condition least susceptible of amelioration. She is difficult to reach, and knows that if at any time she refuse her work there are hundreds ready for it with whom she has absolutely no link. For the working girl, whose work is carried on in workshops, however low, even in the sweater's den itself, trades unionism is a possibility; but to expect much from it for the woman who in her own garret sews together boys' caps at threepence a dozen, or makes sacks or umbrella tops at the prices stated, is useless. The evidence given before the

Sweating Commission, as well as private inquiry, tends to show that much work formerly done by men is now given to women at a lower rate of payment; a transfer which few can wish to see becoming more general. We think it may also be taken for granted that it would not be advantageous for the breadwinning to be divided equally between the husband and wife. Such a universal flooding of the labour market as this would imply would only result in a further depreciation of wages, and in considerable overwork on the part of the wife, who would superadd breadwinning to duties which, if properly performed, are already sufficient, and considerable underwork on the part of the husband; but that there is already a strong tendency in this direction among the poor must be acknowledged, and without doubt its effects are disastrous. For it is not only at the time when work cannot be found by the husband that the wife is the support of the family, but too frequently during long periods when it is not being sought. And too often the woman's earnings are not only accepted without shame, but extorted from her, as her work is compelled, with threats and blows. Again, to expect much from combination for a woman working under such conditions is simply a dream.

In the early part of last year two writers, both well known, gave to the public their views on the question of women's labour. Mrs. Emily Pfeiffer, in a book entitled *Women and Work*,<sup>1</sup> reviewed the whole question from a social and economic point of view, and may well be taken as the mouthpiece of the more moderate section of what is generally called the "Woman's Rights" party; and Mr. Walter Besant, in an article entitled "The Endowment of the Daughter," in *Longmans' Magazine* for April, expressed views which may be justly understood to represent the opinions of the other side.

Mrs. Pfeiffer has carefully considered and answered many of the objections raised to women entering the labour market and competing shoulder to shoulder with men. With that part of her book which treats of the physiological side of the question, we are not at present concerned. If, as her opponents aver, the immediate result of much education and labour is to unfit women for child-bearing, the whole movement need neither be encouraged nor feared. Its effect upon the human race will be too slight to need recognition. The educated woman who cannot bequeath to son or daughter the result of her own cultivation may be looked upon as a being altogether too ephemeral to be of much weight on the development of humanity; and the vast majority of womenkind will speedily gravitate back to their position of comparatively unintelligent dependence on the male worker, and, though a fringe of more highly educated childless women may always exist, yet their effect upon the race will be nil. The question is one which will speedily settle itself.

<sup>1</sup> *Women and Work*. By Emily Pfeiffer. London: Trübner & Co.

But we do not think that, in that portion of the book which treats of the economic and sentimental side of the question, Mrs. Pfeiffer has fully estimated the difficulties by which it is surrounded. She evidently anticipates that in the future women will less and less regard marriage as their natural vocation. She says :<sup>1</sup> "This plea"—that the introduction of women into the labour market will result in the displacement of men who might be supporting them—"would be not only plausible, but tenable, if there were an equal number of marriageable men and women, and every man were compelled to take a wife, every woman a husband. As it is, with the vast numbers of marriageable men abroad or otherwise unavailable, and with the greater nicety of choice which a higher order of culture tends to induce in women, it means only that women shall have the first chance of any prospect of starvation which may happen to be on foot. To whatever end it may be held to work, marriage, looked upon as a natural means of provision for a girl, and the sole means of her rise in life, does and must continue in increasing measure to pass from the calculations of young women whose faculties are rejoicing in congenial exercise."

Mrs. Pfeiffer is evidently not aware that in England widows and older women only are in excess, which fact robs her words of the force they would otherwise possess. But we do not think she appreciates the gravity of the picture which her prediction calls up. She appears to view humanity from the woman's point of view only, forgetting that anything is due to men as to fellow human beings. Nothing could be more harmful to the race than a state of society in which all the virtuous and cultivated women should turn from marriage and embrace celibacy. Mrs. Pfeiffer appears to forget that marriage is even more necessary to the well-being of men than of women, and that whatever tends to discourage it tends to swell the crowd of fallen women who are the worse blot on our civilization, and whose existence in our midst is the worst degradation of womanhood. No one can seriously maintain that any movement which even indirectly tends to add to their number can advance the real elevation of the sex. Can any worse social condition be conceived than one in which the majority of women are either cultivated and intellectual spinsters, working for their own independence, or immoral women, who would then constitute the real companions of men? The one good thing to be said of such a society is that it must speedily effect its own destruction, and could not be lasting. It will doubtless be urged that it is exceedingly wrong that such a result should arise from the choice of celibacy by educated and high-toned women. This may be true, but nevertheless it undoubtedly would eventuate thus. Too many of our reformers appear to forget that what they have to deal with is not what "ought to be," but

<sup>1</sup> *Women and Work*, p. 26.

what "will be," not taking into consideration the moral, or rather immoral, elements with which they have to deal; but planning a social reconstruction, which might be very suitable for Arcadia, but is quite impracticable for ordinary men and women in our time. But we do not in any degree share Mrs. Pfeiffer's anticipations. As we have shown, the number of women for whom marriage is an impossibility owing to deficit of men is entirely insignificant. Neither does history prove that a distaste to mate accompanies the development of the intellect in women; and, if we are to judge by the records of the last fifty years, the most intellectual women and those who are practising lucrative professions are no more averse to marriage than their untaught sisters; indeed, it is exceptional to find a woman of distinction who has ended her life as a spinster. We believe that nature may be trusted to assert herself in spite of education and intellectual occupation. Mrs. Pfeiffer refers justly to the starvation wages which necessity compels women to accept, and to the many evils which arise therefrom, and for this, as for other grave ills, the remedy she suggests is the opening of the labour market to women as to men, and the raising of wages by combination.

Mr. Walter Besant, on the other hand, writing in a more chivalrous spirit, appeals to the moral responsibility of parents, and urges on them the raising of single women above the necessity of work. But it is quite evident that, like Mrs. Pfeiffer, Mr. Besant is not aware that in England it is the widows, and not the single women, who form the difficult class. That he, more fully than Mrs. Pfeiffer, estimates the result of the further entry of women into the labour market, is clear, for he says: "There is another very serious consideration. There is only so much work—a limited quantity—in the world; so many hands for whom occupation can be found; and the number of hands wanted does not greatly exceed the number of male hands ready for it. Now, by giving this work to women, we take it from the men. If we open the Civil Service to women, we take so many posts from the men, which we give to the women *at a lower salary*. If they become cashiers, accountants, clerks, they take these places from the men *at a lower salary*. Always they take lower pay and turn the men out. Well, the men must either go elsewhere, or they must take the lower pay. In either case the happiest lot of all, that of marriage, is rendered more difficult, because the men are made poorer; the position of the toiler is made harder because he gets worse pay, and man's sense of responsibility for the women of his family is destroyed. Nay, in some cases, the men actually live, and live contentedly, on the labour of their wives."

Mr. Besant's remedy is the endowment of the daughter by a deferred

annuity. He writes as if provision for the widow in England were already accomplished. "It took a long while to create in men's minds the duties of life insurance. That has now taken so firm a hold on people, that, although the English bride brings no *dowry*, the bridegroom is not permitted to marry her until he settles a life insurance on her." Would that this were so. But among the poor this duty is never acknowledged,<sup>1</sup> and even in the middle classes it is the exception, not the rule, for any such provision to be made. It is a provision for the widow, more than the endowment of the daughter, that we think should be urged as a remedial measure for many of the troubles of women of to-day. For we believe that if the female labour market were relieved of both widows and married women, the workers would not be found to be in excess of the work, and wages would rise of themselves. This view is supported by the state of domestic service, where singleness is at a premium, and the supply of workers is not equal to the demand. Moreover, among single women combination to raise wages would be a matter of comparative ease. It is the widow working to support her children, and the married woman to keep the drinking husband, or to add in her spare time to the family income, who render trades unionism among women so difficult to achieve. But it is not from men only that the remedy must come, for women can be taught that to enter upon marriage without any provision being made for possible widowhood, the chances of which are so great, is not only "silly" or "foolish," but distinctly wrong: a sin against society, and a wrong to their sister women.

Mr. Besant ends his article with an appeal with which many will sympathize. He says: "My brothers, let our girls work if they wish—perhaps they will be happier if they work; let them work at whatever kind of work they may desire; but not, oh not—because they must."

How much more should this same appeal be enforced for wives and widows? For if it be hard for a young woman to work for her livelihood, who brings to her work the elasticity and brightness of youth, and who has before her the prospects of life, how much harder is it for the woman to whom life has brought great sorrow, who has borne and reared children, and has been unfitted for money making by years of household work as wife and mother, to turn again to breadwinning, to stand shoulder to shoulder with the young and strong in a market where the huge competition makes women's work little less than slavery.

It may be said that Mr. Besant writes chiefly for the middle and

<sup>1</sup> It may be said that with working men the club or benefit society takes the place of the insurance office, but these are not analogous in their work, the benefits received from the club being more for the man during sickness and want of work, than for provision of the widow, and the sum received at the death of the man (of course lessened by the other benefits allowed) is perfectly inadequate for this end.



educated classes, but we believe that the condition of the labour market is the same both with the educated and uneducated, and that the elimination from both of the married woman and widow would go far to solve the question. In these days of diffused education, class runs into class, and it is hard to say where one ends and the other begins, and harder still to define the work which belongs to each, many kinds of work which were formerly despised being now eagerly sought after by highly educated women.

Lastly, we would like to call attention to one cause of the depreciation of female labour which has as yet, we think, been scarcely recognized, and the remedy for which lies with women only. We refer to what we may call the competition of the rich, from which the labour market for men's work is comparatively free.

Of late years we have all of us been made disciples to the gospel of work, but many appear to be unable to realize that work may be equally valuable and noble if unrewarded by wages in money. We do not now refer to original work in literature, or art, or science, which can only be done by specially gifted persons, and which must find its own level and run its risk of gain or loss. This must of necessity be open to all alike, and poor as well as rich be content to take their chance of success or failure. We refer to wage-paid work, where the remuneration earned is little to the rich woman but may mean bread to the poor one. We hear of the daughters of rich men, who are high school mistresses, or undertake other kinds of teaching, and who swell the ranks of the small journalists; of governesses, who leave their daily labours in the carriages of their parents; and of ladies, with well-assured incomes, who do art needlework for pocket money! An advertisement for an educated woman in any capacity will provoke answers from writers who declare that salary is of no moment. A striking instance of this lately came under our notice. An advertisement was inserted in the medical papers for a dental secretary, and among the hundreds of answers received were some which plainly stated that the work was sought for occupation solely, the writers being under no obligation to make money. Yet in this case it would not have been supposed that the employment was of a nature to attract for its own sake. It would seem as if, when, some years back, the closed doors of education and labour were opened to women, the desire to estimate their newly found powers by money-earning displaced for the time being any consideration on the part of the rich for their poorer sisters. But it is not among highly educated women only that this competition exists. Among those who take the work given out from wholesale houses are many daughters of well-to-do tradesmen, &c., who, for a little pocket money, do the sewing which would to some poor woman be the means of procuring the necessaries of life. We do not mean to suggest that any legal restriction should be placed on the money-

earning of the richer, but simply that a more healthy public opinion should be cultivated on the subject.

Unpaid work is waiting at every hand for intelligent women. Work as School Board Members and Managers, as Poor Law Guardians, as teachers for those who cannot afford to pay for instruction, and in all forms of philanthropic reform. And not these alone, for scientific and antiquarian research, and many forms of art, are almost confined to those who may possess independent means; and, though it is undoubtedly more difficult to do good work without payment than with it, yet it is also quite as noble, if not nobler, and we would urge upon every woman for whom money-making is not a necessity to consider seriously before she robs some poorer sister of the means of existence.

We are alarmed at the inroads of the German and Polish Jew at the East End, but neither they, nor the dreaded Chinese themselves, can prove more formidable opponents to the English workman than is the well-brought-up and dowered Englishwoman to her less fortunate sister if she enter the female labour market, and, for her own amusement, or for the means of obtaining some extra enjoyment, compete for the work which to the other would ensure a livelihood.

.

## THE DECIMAL AND THE METRIC SYSTEMS.

AMONG the chief causes which operated to prevent the decimalization of our coinage at the time when the Royal Commission sat some thirty-four or thirty-five years ago, was the desirability of making such a change coincide with the decimalization of our weights and of the measures of length and capacity. This, together with the determined opposition of Lord Overstone, which could not fail to carry considerable weight, prevented its adoption for the moment. Since then, however, circumstances have greatly altered. All the great countries of the world have either adopted a decimal system of coinage, or have declared themselves favourable to it, while no regret has ever been evinced at its substitution for the old, nor has the least complaint been heard of the difficulty of learning the new one. Experience also has proved the small amount of friction with which such a change can be introduced. Surely such a concurrence of testimony should suffice to make any one reflect; and yet we, with our insular prejudices and national obstinacy, are content to stand aloof and protest. As if it were likely that we alone should be right, and all the world besides wrong.

Compulsory education has become law, and the trouble of the needless study of compound arithmetic and of learning our numerous and complex tables of weights, measures, and money is being keenly felt, while the embarrassment of our relations with other countries arising from our antiquated duodecimal system can hardly fail to interfere with our commerce in these days of close competition.

The fact that 10 is not divisible by so many whole numbers as 12 is more an objection in theory to the decimal system than in practice. No nation using it finds any inconvenience from that cause, and the fact of the addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division of decimals being performed as with whole numbers, care being only required as to the position of the decimal point, is an advantage that far outweighs every objection that can be made to their use.

It is indeed strange that in our schools the study of vulgar fractions should be made a primary consideration, and that of decimals, which are both easier and more useful, should be relegated to a secondary place. Decimals are used in all scientific calculations, and

very frequently by commercial men, and, together with logarithms, for which they are necessary, greatly facilitate the keeping of accounts.

The pound sterling was proposed to be divided decimally into a thousand parts, called mils, as follows:—

£1	The sovereign of 10 florins . . . . .	1000 mils
10s.	The half-sovereign . . . . .	500 „
5s.	The crown . . . . .	250 „
4s.	The two-florin piece . . . . .	200 „
2s. 6d.	The half-crown (to be eventually withdrawn)	125 „
2s.	The florin . . . . .	100 „
1s.	The half-florin . . . . .	50 „
6d.	The quarter-florin . . . . .	25 „

New coins to be struck:—

Silver . . . . .	10 mils
Nickel . . . . .	5 „
Copper . . . . .	4 „
Copper . . . . .	2 „
Copper . . . . .	1 mil

Under these circumstances, the decimal currency of any other country would be convertible into ours by the simple multiplication by a whole number, or by a decimal, or by the two combined, as the case might be.

Say, we wished to convert 15,690 fr. 20 c. into pounds and mils: as 1 fr. is, roughly speaking, 0·04 of a pound sterling, and  $15,690 \cdot 20 \times 0\cdot04 = 627\cdot608$ , this last will be the number of pounds and mils, or, at the rate of exchange of 25 fr. 26 c. = £1, the multiplier would be 0·03959, which would give £621·175. The comparison of equivalent values of any two decimal currencies would be made on the same principle, and the facilities of exchange would thus be greatly increased.

The fact also that multiplication or division by 10 in decimals consists in merely moving the decimal point one place to the right or the left, respectively, marvellously facilitates many calculations.

Although, however, such an arrangement as the above might do for our money, and although by it we might retain most of our present coins, it seems next to an impossibility to arrive at any convenient system of decimalization by which any important part of our present system of weights and measures could be retained.

We have troy, avoirdupois, apothecaries', coal, wool, and hay and straw weights. Then imperial, dry, coal, and wine measures. Next cubic, and builders' measures. Next land, and square or superficial measures. Lastly, linear, cloth, and nautical measures—seventeen in all, besides several supplementary ones, all differing more or less from one another. In some, for instance, the pound, the most important weight of all, differs very materially. The troy pound, for example, is 5760 grains, while the avoirdupois pound is 7000

grains. It seems, then, perfectly hopeless to attempt their decimalization, and still more so to render the measures of weight and capacity in any way connected with the linear one, as should be the case. In view, then, of this fact, and considering how many important nations have already adopted the metric system, why should we not adopt it offhand?

The French, or metric, system professes to start from a measurement of the earth's meridian at the latitude of Paris, the mètre being the forty-millionth part of such a circle. It is divided firstly into ten parts, each of which is called a *décimètre*; each of these is further divided into ten, so that every one of the latter constitutes one-hundredth of the whole, and it is called a *centimètre*; lastly, each centimètre is divided again into ten, each division thus forming one-thousandth of the whole, and it is called a *millimètre*. It has been found, however, that, tested by the more perfect instruments of the present day, notwithstanding the care used in the calculations, this measurement was inexact by nearly a millimètre.

The metric system has, however, been adopted in the following countries, and its use either has been, or soon will be, rendered compulsory in most of them:—

France	Austria	Spain
Belgium	Turkey	Portugal
Holland	United States	Sweden
Switzerland	Denmark	Peru
Greece	Argentino Republic	Brazil
Italy	Columbia	Chili
Russia	Ecuador	Mexico
Germany	Venezuela	

Any slight inexactitude, therefore, in the original measurement of the mètre becomes of but little consequence, seeing how many times the standard measure, originally deposited in the archives of Paris, must have been reproduced with the utmost attainable accuracy, and the models distributed all over the world. Some of the names may be thought long and unsuitable to the English language, but they can easily be shortened.

We know that in making such a proposal we are shocking the prejudices of some persons who are opposed to anything French, particularly anything which is the outcome of the French Revolution; but we have no right to let national feeling carry us thus far, especially when we see that our scientific men have already adopted the metric system on the score of convenience, and it is to be hoped that the majority of Englishmen are above such sentiments. Still, it is strange indeed to see a great nation, which professes to lead the very van of civilization, refusing what is acknowledged on all hands to be a most desirable reform on paltry grounds.

We have seen whence the mètre is derived and how it is divided.

The litre is derived from it, being a measure the interior capacity of which is equal in bulk to the cubic décimètre, and the kilogramme is the weight of one litre of distilled water, all these measurements and weighings being taken at the standard temperature of  $4^{\circ}$  above zero of centigrade, that being the point at which water is at its greatest density. The weighings are further made while the atmospheric pressure is equal to 760 millimètres of the barometer, that being the standard pressure. The gramme is one-thousandth part of the kilogramme, and is consequently the weight of one cubic centimètre of distilled water at  $4^{\circ}$  centigrade. A perfect cube of metal, of which the facets, measured at the standard temperature, are each one square décimètre, when weighed first in air and then in water, both being at the standard temperature, and the air at the standard pressure, should show a difference between the two weighings of exactly one kilogramme.

The multiplications and divisions of the mètre are as follows:—

#### ITINERARY MEASURES.

Myriamètre . . . . .	10,000 mètres
Kilomètre . . . . .	1,000 "
Hectomètre . . . . .	100 "
Décamètre . . . . .	10 "

#### LINEAR MEASURES.

Mètre—			
Décimètre . . . . .	$\frac{1}{10}$	=	0.1 m.
Centimètre . . . . .	$\frac{1}{100}$	=	0.01 m.
Millimètre . . . . .	$\frac{1}{1000}$	=	0.001 m.
Also the decimal divisions of the milli-	$\frac{1}{10000}$ $\frac{1}{100000}$	mètre used in scientific investigations {	= 0.0001 m.
mètre used in scientific investigations {			= 0.00001 m.

#### LAND MEASURES.

Hectare, a square of which the side is 100 m. =	10,000 sq. m.
Are . . . . .	100 "
Centiare . . . . .	1 "

#### MEASURES OF CAPACITY.

Kilolitre	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1,000 litres
Hectolitre	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	100 "
Dékalitre	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	10 "
Litre—								
Décilitre	.	.	.	.	.	.	$\frac{1}{10}$	= 0.1 "
Centilitre	.	.	.	.	.	.	$\frac{1}{100}$	= 0.01 "
Also for scientific purposes the cubic							$\frac{1}{1000}$	= 0.001
centimètre, or c.c., and $\frac{1}{10}$ th of a								
cubic centimètre.	.	.	.	.	.	.	$\frac{1}{10000}$	= 0.0001

#### DRY MEASURE.

Décastère . . . . .	10 stères
Stère . . . . .	1 cubic mètre
Décistère . . . . .	$\frac{1}{10}$ stère.

## WEIGHTS.

Tonne, or Millier	{ Weight of 1 cubic mètre of distilled water at 4° Centigrade	
Quintal . . . . .	100	kilogrammes
Myriagramme . . . . .	10	"
Kilogramme . . . . .	1,000	grammes
Hectogramme . . . . .	100	"
Dékagramme . . . . .	10	"
Gramme		
Décigramme . . . . .	$\frac{1}{10}$ th of a	gramme = 0·1 gr.
Centigramme . . . . .	$\frac{1}{100}$ th	" = 0·01 gr.
Milligramme . . . . .	$\frac{1}{1000}$ th	" = 0·001 gr.
For scientific purposes $\frac{1}{10}$ th of a milligramme . . . . .	{ $\frac{1}{10000}$ th " = 0·0001 gr.	

It will thus be seen that the measures of capacity, as well as the weights, are derived by the most simple means from the mètre, and that the minutest fraction of the linear measure constantly bears the same order of relation to the unit in a way which would be next to impossible in the duodecimal system, so that, by the metric system it becomes possible to compare the most microscopic object, or even the length of a wave of light, and the almost incalculable distances of interstellar space. Is it possible to imagine a finer conception than this, as applied to this line of thought, where we make the same measure, divided on the same general principle, serve alike to estimate the size of the most inconceivably minute atom and to gauge immensities of the universe, and derivatives of which might be used equally to find the bulk of the merest grain of mist or to measure the volume of the ocean, to calculate the weight of the whole earth or to find that of the smallest particle of dust that floats before the wind? Such is the metric system.

The objection that the centimètre is inconveniently small as compared with the English inch, and the millimètre less handy than the eighths, sixteenths, and thirty-seconds of an inch, as also all the sentimental talk about the love of the British workman for his two-foot rule, which he carries doubled up in his breeches pocket, is merely the dictum of a confirmed grumbler searching for an objection. The French workman also carries his mètre doubled up into three, and opens it more or less, as much as required for use. The objection as to the difficulty of a working man not grasping such an innovation is no more reasonable. As has been said already, though beforehand there were plenty of people to predict disaster, the metric system, when once introduced, produced nothing but universal satisfaction, and Englishmen are not usually considered to be more dense than their neighbours. As to the weights, the tonne is only about 35½ lb. less than our present ton, and the half-quintal about 1½ lb. less than the hundredweight, so that the prices for heavy goods would require but little adjustment. Then, as to the compound

units, such as the kilogrammètre, corresponding to our foot-pound, or the calorie, corresponding to our unit of heat, or the cheval vapeur, corresponding to our horse-power, those derived from the metric system are just as convenient, only easier to use, and the English and French horse-power may practically be said almost to agree, so that, with all these advantages, the desirability of the change here suggested is evident.



## STATISTICS *VERSUS* MALTHUS.

ACCORDING to Malthus, who published his *Principle of Population* in 1798, anything like a condition of universal comfort can never be reached on earth. The first two chapters of his essay contain the gist of his argument. His theory is that there is a constant and irremediable pressure of population on the means of subsistence. It is the nature of human beings to increase at a greater ratio than their food. "A strong check on population, from the difficulty of acquiring food, must be in constant operation. This difficulty must fall somewhere, and must necessarily be severely felt in some or other of the various forms of misery, or the fear of misery, by a large portion of mankind. . . ."<sup>1</sup> "There are few States in which there is not a constant effort in the population to increase beyond the means of subsistence. This constant effort as constantly tends to subject the lower classes of society to distress, and to prevent any great permanent melioration of their condition."<sup>2</sup>

Supposing a community were confined to a small area of land, so that no extraneous assistance could be obtained, it is conceivable that its numbers might increase beyond the capacity of the soil to produce subsistence. But this fact is no reason why the world should be considered incapable of producing sufficient food to supply the needs of any possible numbers that can appear for centuries hence. If a family were confined upon six square yards of land, there would not, in a few generations, at the ordinary rate of increase, be standing room for the occupants; but would such a case afford any grounds for concluding that the earth had not sufficient space to afford standing room for its inhabitants? Arithmetic will show the absurdity of any such conclusion, for it has been calculated that the whole existing population of the globe, estimated at 1,400,000,000 persons, could find comfortable standing room within the limits of a field ten miles square.<sup>3</sup> We believe statistics will also show the conclusions of Malthus to be preposterous. It is true the population might outrun the means of subsistence if it were confined upon a

<sup>1</sup> *The Principle of Population*, p. 2. By T. R. Malthus. Reeves & Turner, Seventh edition, 1872.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 9.

<sup>3</sup> *The Distribution of Products*, p. 22. By Edward Atkinson. G. P. Putnam's Sons. Second edition, 1885.

given area, but then the deficiency of food would arise in the circumstances which caused the overcrowding, and not from the incapacity of the world to produce subsistence as Malthus' doctrine has taught. Such a case of overcrowding has nothing to do with the question, whether the capacity of the world is sufficient to supply any possible population that can exist for many centuries with abundant sustenance, supposing labour is efficiently applied to raise it.

What we want to discover is, whether population ever has so increased as to exceed Nature's capacity to supply its needs of subsistence; whether, in fact, "a strong check on population from the difficulty of acquiring food *must* be in constant operation;" whether "this difficulty *must* be felt somewhere, and *must* necessarily be severely felt in some or other of the various forms of misery, or the fear of misery, by a large portion of mankind."

That population never has so increased, and is in no appreciable danger of doing so, at all events until the distant future, we maintain to be absolutely demonstrable from statistics. We do not deny that vice and misery have kept down population. Undoubtedly they have done so to an enormous extent. All we say is, the vice and misery have had their origin in man's ignorance and folly, not in "the niggardliness of Nature" in supplying his wants.

The generally admitted fact, that poverty has a tendency to stimulate the increase of population, seems to point to the existence of a law as regards population exactly the reverse of the Malthusian. The affluent notoriously do not have the number of children that parents in straitened circumstances generate. Statistical evidence incontrovertibly proves that a large community, other things being equal, is capable of producing more food and more wealth generally, man per man, than is possible in a smaller community. Europe has overgrown the dread of famine, and no doubt in future days will outlive the dread of pestilence. Famines are objects of terror in the early stages of social growth when numbers are numerically weak. Thus the last great famine that visited England was in the fourteenth century. At the present day, with a population in round numbers eleven times greater, a famine is so exceedingly improbable that such a calamity is no longer feared.

Statistics will now be brought forward from Mulhall's *Dictionary of Statistics*, to show how enormously the world's population has increased during the present century, and to what extent the inhabitants per square mile have increased in each country during the period.

A.—POPULATION.<sup>1</sup>

	Thousands Omitted.				
	1800	1820	1840	1860	1880
United Kingdom . . . . .	15,570	20,710	26,540	28,730	34,650
France . . . . .	27,720	30,380	34,102	37,290	37,430
Germany . . . . .	22,330	26,040	30,590	36,410	45,260
Russia . . . . .	38,140	44,220	54,080	65,730	84,440
Austria . . . . .	21,230	23,620	28,170	32,240	37,830
Italy . . . . .	13,380	15,790	18,610	21,820	28,910
Spain . . . . .	10,440	11,680	11,820	15,560	16,290
Portugal . . . . .	3,080	3,210	3,490	4,030	4,350
Belgium . . . . .	2,960	3,280	4,020	4,690	5,480
Holland . . . . .	2,280	2,510	3,130	3,620	4,060
Denmark . . . . .	900	1,040	1,290	1,580	1,960
Sweden . . . . .	2,330	2,580	3,210	3,870	4,610
Norway . . . . .	880	1,010	1,280	1,590	1,950
Switzerland . . . . .	1,820	2,040	2,310	2,530	2,810
Greece . . . . .	9,200	10,300	1,020	1,310	1,690
Servia . . . . .			12,490	1,240	1,920
Romania . . . . .				4,390	5,330
Turkey . . . . .				10,230	8,310
Europe . . . . .	172,260	198,410	236,150	275,860	312,990
United States . . . . .	5,310	9,640	17,070	31,440	50,410
South America . . . . .	20,000	22,000	23,500	24,800	25,600
British India . . . . .	70,000	83,000	98,500	143,300	191,400
Canada . . . . .	470	840	1,730	3,360	4,340
Australia . . . . .	10	90	410	1,330	2,880
Cape Colony . . . . .	40	80	270	420	1,030
	268,090	314,060	377,630	480,510	588,550

In the above Table Lombardy is counted Italian, and Schleswig German, territory.

B.—POPULATION.—INHABITANTS PER SQUARE MILE.<sup>2</sup>

	1800	1820	1840	1860	1880
United Kingdom . . . . .	131	172	221	240	290
France . . . . .	135	148	165	175	180
Germany . . . . .	108	124	145	174	217
Russia . . . . .	18	20	25	30	40
Austria . . . . .	90	99	118	134	158
Italy . . . . .	120	138	162	190	247
Spain . . . . .	51	58	59	78	82
Portugal . . . . .	88	92	101	115	124
Belgium . . . . .	260	287	348	409	480
Holland . . . . .	177	195	228	260	312
Denmark . . . . .	60	71	89	108	127
Sweden . . . . .	14	15	19	23	27
Norway . . . . .	7	8	11	13	15
Switzerland . . . . .	114	127	145	160	175
Greece . . . . .	33	40	52	65	84
Turkey, &c. . . . .	70	80	100	120	120
Europe . . . . .	48	54	64	75	85
United States . . . . .	12	6	10	11	14
Canada . . . . .	—	—	—	—	1
Australia . . . . .	—	—	—	—	1
Cape Colony . . . . .	—	1	2	3	4
British India . . . . .	150	161	197	158	210
South America . . . . .	3	3	3	3	3

<sup>1</sup> Mulhall's *Dictionary of Statistics*, p. 356. G. Routledge & Sons. 1884.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 357.

Malthus overlooked the important factor of improvement in transit in his calculations. In the foregoing Table B, we see that in the year 1800 A.D. the number of inhabitants per square mile in the United Kingdom was 131, and that in the year 1880 it was 290, which is more than double. Yet, with the continued increase of population, "the preponderance of England is every day increasing, not only in population, but also in wealth and in all elements of national importance."<sup>1</sup>

"The estimates of public wealth by the most experienced economists show that the capital of the United Kingdom has doubled in forty years."<sup>2</sup>

Estimates.	Wealth of the United Kingdom.
1800 Beck & Pulteney . . . . .	£1,800,000,000
1840 Porter . . . . .	4,000,000,000
1860 Levi . . . . .	6,000,000,000
1877 Giffen . . . . .	8,840,000,000

Reflection, then, will, we think, convince us that the misery and disease induced by insufficient nourishment, which has unquestionably tended to keep down population in the past, cannot have been due to any lack of Nature's bounty. The world's population is larger now than at any period within the range of history; and as the earth is capable of yielding sufficiency of food, even under the existing order of things, with whole continents to a large extent lying waste, it is clear, as far as production is concerned, the earth could have afforded abundance in past ages, *if the requisite intelligence and labour had been forthcoming*. The Malthusian theory does not accord with facts. As populations grow, instead of production being less per head, statistics clearly prove it to be greater. The intelligence which is fostered in large communities; the advantages of the division of labour; the improved transit, which increases in efficiency with an enterprising people in proportion as numbers become large, and is impracticable until population has developed—are more than a match in the competition of production for any advantage a thinly scattered community may in some respects gain on a virgin soil. Malthus and his followers, while bringing prominently forward the needs of an increasing population, keep out of view the increasing means of supply which the additional labour of greater numbers will produce. Man has no power to create anything: all he can do is to change the position of things. His labour in production is confined to this; and so long as there are a pair of hands to provide for every mouth, with intelligence and energy ample production is assured, unless society erects artificial barriers by means of its laws regarding the distribution of wealth. The real cause of much of the vice and misery existing in society seems to lie in the unequal distribution of wealth.

<sup>1</sup> *The Progress of the World*, p. 109. By M. G. Mulhall. Edward Stanford. 1880.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 110.

But, it is often said, if England did not import food she could not feed her population. Statements of this kind are altogether without foundation and are most misleading. "If England by any contingency were compelled to raise wheat, it would suffice to sow an area of five counties the size of Devonshire to supply all the needs of the three Kingdoms at seven bushels per head."<sup>1</sup> Edward Atkinson, the American statistician, declares "the average crop of wheat in the United States and Canada would give one person in every twenty of the population of the globe a barrel of flour in each year, with enough to spare for seed; and the land capable of producing wheat is not occupied to anything like one-twentieth of its extent. We can raise grain enough on a small part of the territory of the United States to feed the world."<sup>2</sup>

But further, not only is a small area of the world sufficient to raise food for the whole of its population, but the labour of a small section of the population is sufficient to raise the food for the whole inhabitants of the globe. The fallacy of the Malthusian theory will be realized when we once understand how small an area of the world is sufficient to raise the food of mankind. For so long as there is plenty of land, we may easily calculate what toil would be required for each individual to supply himself with wheat.

The average crop of wheat in England in 1880 was twenty-eight,<sup>3</sup> bushels per acre, and seven bushels is sufficient to supply an individual with food for a year. A quarter of an acre, therefore, would be sufficient land to provide the absolute necessary food for one person. With nothing but ordinary garden tools, a man ought to be able to cultivate such a little patch of ground in the time which would be equivalent to half an hour's exertion per day throughout the year. To produce the seven bushels of wheat would be a very small tax upon his energies, although in such circumstances it would be produced under great disadvantages. A community sufficiently numerous to render the separation of employments practicable would produce much greater results, man per man, than would be possible in the case of an individual working solitarily.

Even with comparatively primitive machinery and no great organization in the division of labour, there is no doubt that the labour of one man would be sufficient to supply the necessary food for a considerable number. Professor Rogers states: "I find that in early English agriculture, as in modern, a workman to twenty acres is a liberal allowance of labour."<sup>4</sup> Now, at the average of twenty-eight bushels to the acre, upon the above basis, one man's labour would raise  $20 \times 28 = 560$  bushels, and, allowing seven bushels

<sup>1</sup> *The Progress of the World*, p. 126. By M. G. Mulhall.

<sup>2</sup> *The Distribution of Products*, p. 22. By Edward Atkinson.

<sup>3</sup> *The Landed Interest*, p. 177. By James Caird. London: Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co. 1880.

<sup>4</sup> *The Economic Interpretation of History*, p. 165. By J. E. Thorold Rogers.

to each person, his labour would raise wheat sufficient for eighty persons. But with a minute division of labour, aided by modern machinery, man's power of producing food is enormously increased. We will give a verbatim extract from Mr. Edward Atkinson's address to the British Association at Montreal in 1884, as we have not the means to make such a calculation or to test its accuracy.

"What people gain their bread with so little exertion of human labour as the people of this country? If we convert the work done in the direction of machinery upon the great bonanza farms of far Dakota into the yearly work of a given number of men, we find that the equivalent in a fair season, on the best farms, of one man's work for three hundred working days in one year is 5300 bushels of wheat. Setting aside an ample quantity for seed, this wheat can be moved to Minneapolis, where it is converted into 1000 barrels of flour, and the flour is moved to the city of New York. By similar processes of conversion of the work of milling and barrelling into the labour of one man for a year, we find that the labour of milling and putting into barrels 1000 barrels of flour is the equivalent of a man's work for one year. By a computation based upon the trains moving on the New York Central Railroad, and the number of men engaged upon the work, we find that 120 tons, the mean between 4500 bushels of wheat and 1000 barrels of flour, can be moved 1700 to 2000 miles under the direction of one man working eighteen months, equal to one and a half men working one year. When this wheat reaches New York City, and comes into the possession of a great baker, who has established the manufacture of bread upon a large scale, and who sells the best bread to the working people of New York at the lowest possible price, we find that 1000 barrels of flour can be converted into bread and sold over the counter by the work of three persons for one year. Let us add to the six and a half men already named the work of another man six months, or half a man one year, to keep the machinery in repair, and our modern miracle is that seven men suffice to give 1000 persons all the bread they customarily consume in a year. If to these we add three for the work of providing fuel and other materials to the railroad and to the baker, our final result is that ten men working one year serve bread to one thousand."<sup>1</sup>

It may be objected that the machinery which alone renders such results possible would take years of patient accumulation and industry to construct. The rapid recovery, however, of France after the Franco-German War makes the old theory of capital no longer tenable.<sup>2</sup> Edward Atkinson, mentioned above, reckons that "capital or labour saved in a concrete form never exceeds in value the sum of two or three years' production even in the richest state or nation." And these statistics are approximately verified by Mulhall, who gives the accumulated wealth of the United Kingdom as follows:—<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *The Distribution of Products*, p. 75. By Edward Atkinson.

<sup>2</sup> "Should the national capital be diminished, the condition of the great body of the people would be greatly deteriorated; the wages of labour would be reduced, and pauperism, with its attendant train of vice, misery, and crime, would spread its ravages throughout the largest portion of society."—*Principles of Political Economy*, p. 60. By J. R. McCulloch. London: Ward, Lock & Co.

<sup>3</sup> *Mulhall's Dictionary of Statistics*, p. 469 ("Wealth").

Land . . . . .	1880 millions
Cattle . . . . .	235 "
Railways . . . . .	770 "
Public Works . . . . .	547 "
Houses . . . . .	2280 "
Furniture . . . . .	1140 "
Merchandise . . . . .	350 "
Bullion . . . . .	143 "
Shipping . . . . .	120 "
Sundries . . . . .	1255 "
<hr/>	
Total . . . . .	8720 "

Taking, then, the aggregate wealth at 8720 millions, and the value of the annual income at 1247 millions,<sup>1</sup> we find about seven years' income in the aggregate wealth. When, however, we take out the land, valued above at 1880 millions, we find the value of the aggregate wealth equals about five and a half years' annual production. It is not practicable to include the value of the land in the aggregate wealth of a society, or we have the paradox—the scarcer the land the greater the wealth. The proprietary right to the land is no doubt a source of great wealth to individual proprietors; but from a social point of view, a community would be wealthier where there was sufficient land to meet the requirements of all, even though its exchange value was very low.

The above statistics solve the mystery of the rapid recovery of an enterprising people after a devastating war. Even if all the wealth were destroyed, which is never the case, it would only represent some five years' normal production in the richest nation in the world. No population ever works up to its productive capacity or anything near it. There is always a reserve force, as in our idle classes, unemployed, paupers, criminals, women, and children. So that in an emergency much more labour than ordinary is applicable for production. How quickly buildings can be restored has been proved over and over again in the case of earthquakes. Chicago was rebuilt, as if by magic, when a few years ago fire had demolished a large part of the city. So railways and machinery generally, if destroyed, could quickly be restored under the spur of necessity. Given the numbers, with developed intellectual and moral energy, and a population can quickly produce the requisite machinery for the provision of its food, which, being completed, the labour of a small percentage of the population can supply food for the whole. Moreover, the greater the population the less the relative tax upon its energy for its food supply, so long as there is land to raise it upon.

The prediction that the earth will eventually be overcrowded is mere assumption. It certainly is not so now, nor can it be for some centuries, even at the greatest known rate of increase. Nor must it be forgotten that the quantity of food raised per acre will

<sup>1</sup> Muirhead's *Dictionary of Statistics*, p. 245 ("Income").

very probably be increased in the future, as it certainly has been in the past. Doubtless there is a limit to the production of corn to the acre, but no one knows what that limit is. It does not seem by any means true, within limits, that Ricardo's teaching is correct, that greater returns can only be procured at a greater relative cost. "The sewage farm at Croydon is an area of 600 acres, a light and not otherwise fertile gravel. But being irrigated by the drainage, the fertilizing powers of which it completely exhausts, and discharges as pure water, it will grow for ten months in the year an average monthly crop of rye grass at the rate of seven tons to the acre. After a time the sewage is shut off from some portions and oats sown on the land. Of these the land commonly yields a good 100 bushels to the acre."<sup>1</sup> We have only to call to mind the enormous crops of the market gardeners around London to realize how immensely more productive the land is capable of becoming under a system of heavy manuring. These gardeners raise three heavy crops annually upon much of their land. The supply of manure, too, will in a great measure come from the source that creates the additional demand, when chemistry enables the inhabitants of towns, as it has already partially done, to utilize the sewage which is now permitted to be wasted in polluting our rivers.

That the increase of population is one of the factors of progress we do not doubt, but we cannot believe in Mr. Herbert Spencer's theory that progress either has been, or will be, induced by "pressure on the means of subsistence," *as far as mere food is concerned*. The evidence seems rather to show that the increased facility in producing food, which is possible in large communities, renders them capable of more easily supplying their wants. In this way ever increasing desires arise, taxing the energy of the population for gratification, and so producing a pressure which Mr. Spencer assigns to the deficiency of food.

When Mr. Spencer wrote his *Principles of Biology* he had not access to the statistics which Mulhall, Giffen, Levi, and Professor Thorold Rogers have since supplied. These statistics seem to render his theory, that danger from deficiency of food<sup>2</sup> originates with increase of population, quite untenable. Even the selected statistics given in the foregoing pages seem sufficient to establish the point; and a much more formidable array might be produced if space permitted.

There seems little room for doubt, however, that the increase of population has been one of the factors of progress. For the purpose

<sup>1</sup> *The Economic Interpretation of History*, p. 281. By J. E. Thorold Rogers.

<sup>2</sup> *Principles of Biology*, vol. ii. p. 504. By Herbert Spencer. (Third Thousand.)

<sup>3</sup> "But the danger of death which does not diminish is that produced by augmentation of numbers itself—the danger from deficiency of food."—*Principles of Biology*, vol. ii. p. 498 (H. Spencer).



of establishing the fact, let us compare the productive power of mediæval times with that of our own day. We shall see how the facility of producing food has enlarged men's desires, and has opened out a field for their energies which was formerly unknown. For, after all, an individual's tastes are in a great measure the mere consequences of his circumstances. Supply a man amply with food, and a desire for cleanliness and decent clothing may be expected to develop. As soon as these primary wants are satisfied, a comfortable home will be sought, which in its turn will be a nursery of refinement. Pleasure derived from Nature and Art is usually confined to men exempted from the lower privations; and, in any case, its culture will require leisure for development. This necessary leisure will be dependent upon the prior satisfaction of the more urgent wants.

Professor Thorold Rogers<sup>1</sup> estimates the population of England and Wales in the fourteenth century at 2½ millions at the utmost. The same authority tells us, from information gathered from ancient documents relating to the estates of Merton College, Oxford, that, in 1333-6, the average crop was nine bushels of wheat and fifteen of barley to the acre, the seed being two bushels of the former, and four of the latter grain. "This produce is often in excess of the average, and the oldest writer on English agriculture, Walter de Henley, expressly states that, unless the farmer reaps full six bushels an acre, he is cultivating at a loss, giving reasons for his estimate."<sup>2</sup>

It will be interesting to see in what style the manor-houses were furnished. In mediæval times the lords of the manor resided in these houses when in the rural districts. "As might be expected, the furniture of the manor-house was scanty. Glass, though by no means excessively dear, appears to have been rarely used. A table put on tressels, and laid aside when out of use, a few forms and stools, or a long bench stuffed with straw or wool, covered with a straw cushion worked like a beehive, with one or two chairs of wood or straw, and a chest or two for linen, formed the hall furniture. A brass pot or two for boiling, and two or three brass dishes; a few wooden platters and trenchers, or more rarely of pewter; an iron or latten candlestick; a kitchen knife or two, a box or barrel for salt, a brass ewer and basin, formed the movables of the ordinary house. The walls were garnished with mattocks, scythes, reaping-hooks, buckets, corn-measures, and empty sacks. The dormitory contained a rude bed, and but rarely sheets or blankets, for the gown of the day was generally the coverlet at night."<sup>3</sup>

The nineteenth century, then, presents as great an advance in food products—in quantity, quality, and variety—as it does in other commodities. The artisan of to-day has a greater variety of

<sup>1</sup> *A History of Agriculture and Prices in England*, vol. i. p. 51.

<sup>2</sup> *The Economic Interpretation of History*, p. 58.

<sup>3</sup> *A History of Agriculture and Prices in England*, vol. i. p. 13. By J. E. Thorold Rogers.

food, is better clothed upon the whole, although some of his garments may not be as costly, and is better washed than the noble of mediæval times. Our meanest domestics would scorn to live in such surroundings as satisfied the mediæval aristocracy in their manor-houses. Modern times have given birth to a thousand desires, which now need to be gratified to make life worth living, and competition seems likely to increase rather than diminish, so urging the human race onward on the path of progress.

Without a numerous population an advanced civilization is impossible. External aggression has prevented any extraordinary progress in a small community; and has forced it to increase its numbers by conquest or otherwise, or has caused it to be absorbed into a more numerous or successful rival. If more immediate causes did not produce aggression from neighbouring societies, sooner or later scarcity brought about the result. In the rude state of agriculture characterizing primitive societies, variability of climate made the constant recurrence of famine felt. In such seasons of scarcity, a prosperous community became an object of general aggression, and sometimes of combined attack; and unless its numbers were sufficient to enable it to defend itself, its very existence was at once threatened.

The advantage of mere numbers may be traced, with ever increasing complexity, in more advanced civilizations. No modern nation would be safe from aggression which had not a considerable military organization; or, at least, which had not the means of creating it in the event of necessity. Other things equal, an army of two hundred thousand men will be stronger than an army of one hundred thousand. The strength, however, of an army is not only dependent upon its numbers, but upon the efficiency also of its organization. The day has long since passed for nations to be dependent for their means of defence upon an army of raw recruits, who, upon emergencies, assemble for a short period of military service, as in the Middle Ages. Standing armies have become essential in Europe, and the military profession has developed into a distinct calling. In proportion to the efficiency of an army will be its dependence upon the industrial classes for supplies. If the army is to devote its energies exclusively to military affairs, it is evident it cannot be self-supporting. The physical courage and endurance of the soldier is dependent upon his supply of food: and the number and efficiency of his weapons is dependent upon the precision acquired by the workmen in the innumerable industries through which the weapons pass in their manufacture. This precision can only be gained by practice; and the minute sub-divisions of labour, which alone make this practice possible, necessitate a great number of workmen, and a great demand for the commodity produced by them. Moreover, the efficiency of an army will greatly depend upon its

means of transit and communication. In modern warfare, fleets, railroads, and telegraphs are most important elements. Military organization, then, is dependent on and must go hand in hand with industrial organization; and the complex industrial organization necessary for the production of high results is dependent for its very existence upon larger numbers of workmen.

While, however, a numerous population is an essential of that efficiency of labour which is capable of producing a high standard of material well-being, the moral and intellectual nature of the people, partly resulting from organization and partly producing it, is no less essential. How little mere numbers necessarily promote material well-being, when the moral and intellectual nature of the people is too low to produce organization, is strikingly displayed in the Eastern world. Here we find vast populations, but populations utterly deficient in all organization; and the consequence has been that rapacious Governments have rendered efficient labour impossible. We look in vain for any progress in some of the most favoured localities in the world as regards both climate and fertility. Grinding despotisms have wrung all energy from the cultivators of the soil, and have blasted all industrial enterprise. The only safeguard against the agents of a rapacious Government has been to have nothing worth removing, or wealth that could easily be concealed, an impossibility with agricultural produce and manufactures. Under such circumstances, it is not likely that much beyond the necessities of existence would be produced.

It does not follow that population will continue indefinitely to increase at the rate it has done in the present century. The rapid growth at one period in the life of an individual is no ground for assuming an equal growth—or in fact any growth at all—will be maintained through all the stages of existence; and what evidence we possess tends to the same inference respecting social growth. Even supposing a continued uniform growth of population has been the record of the past, it would be contrary to all analogy to presume an equal growth would indefinitely continue. Whatever the true law of the expansion of population may be, it is evident the old theory that the population expands with prosperity does not tally with facts. The population of France only increased<sup>1</sup> by 612,000 during the last decade, although its accumulated wealth<sup>2</sup> and earnings<sup>3</sup>, with the exception of Great Britain and the United States, were greater than any nation in the world. The Jewish race, which has been exceptionally affluent, has been extremely slow of growth. Our peerages are frequently lapsing for want of descendants, and it is not the wealthy rector, but the poor curate, who is notorious for a numerous family.

<sup>1</sup> *Balance Sheet of the World, 1870-1880*, p. 25 (Mulhall).

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 31.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 33.

Whether "the process of civilization must inevitably diminish fertility, and at last destroy its excess," by the slow process Mr. Herbert Spencer points out, or whether there may be other causes in the future, now unperceived, which will prevent the over-population of the globe, it is futile to predict. Few calculations of things to happen even fifty years after prove accurate, the wisdom of the wise being confounded by dominant factors altogether unperceived. What it concerns us to know is that, even with the present productive forces of civilization, the human race can easily raise sufficient food for all to be profusely supplied; and there must be sufficient land to provide for the needs of any possible population for some centuries hence. If man lived by bread alone, probably one hour's exertion a day would be more than ample to supply his wants.

The increase of population, then, so far from being regarded as a calamity, is in reality one of the factors of progress. Modern statistics silence Malthus with crushing force. They bring forward incontrovertible evidence that a large community, *ceteris paribus*, is capable of producing more wealth, man per man, than is possible in a smaller community. They lead us to expect, as populations grow and become more organized in the future, that the energy of the masses will be taxed in a constantly lessening degree for the provision of the necessities of existence, and that leisure will be greater and the comforts and refinements of life more easily attainable. As for mere food, abundance is already secured by Western civilizations, while a mere tithe of the energy of the population is devoted to its production.

No doubt it is the existing unequal distribution of wealth that hides these facts from general view. Abuses notoriously are long-lived, and error dies hard. After nearly a century of pernicious life in England, Malthus' doctrine, so fondly cherished by the affluent, is bound to wane under the light of modern statistics. With it will die an older and still more pernicious belief, that God has ordained the poor man's lot with its attendant hopelessness and misery. The dawn of a brighter era seems to be breaking, when, in due time, it will be perceived that poverty, and well nigh all the ills of life, arise from man's ignorance and selfishness, and are curable as he grows wiser and better.

## INDEPENDENT SECTION.

*Under the above title a limited portion of THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW is occasionally set apart for the reception of able Articles, which, though harmonizing with the general spirit and aims of the Review, may contain opinions at variance with the particular ideas or measures it advocates. The object of the Editors in introducing this department is to facilitate the expression of opinion by men of high mental power and culture, who, while they are zealous friends of freedom and progress, yet differ widely, on special points of great practical concern, both from the Editors and from each other.]*

---

### HOW EVERY TENANT-FARMER MAY BECOME HIS OWN LANDLORD.

DIFFICULT questions have sometimes been determined by considering hypothetical conditions somewhat analogous, but not exactly corresponding, to the circumstances of the case at issue, then applying strictly theoretical methods to their solution ; sometimes by grouping different methods, each of which in its own place has been applied and has served its purpose well, then combining such parts of these various methods as may fit the case at issue, although it may differ in some of its terms from any of the previous cases treated.

The writer proposes to call attention to several methods by which different problems relating to land tenure have been solved in the United States, and then to suggest a combination of these different methods which may possibly find a useful application to the questions affecting land tenure in Great Britain and Ireland.

The territory which now constitutes the State of New York was formerly occupied and controlled by the Dutch ; great grants of land were made by their Government to individuals, who also bought out Indian claimants and obtained a sort of title by making some small payments to them. These titles were recognized by the English after their conquest of the territory : and like estates were acquired in large parcels by grants from the English Government or their patentees. In later years these great estates became known as the Livingston, the Van Rensselaer, and other "manors." The owners who held under the Dutch title were called "the Patroons." The area of these great manors being too large for single use and

occupancy were sometimes divided and leased in smaller parcels upon conditional or perpetual ground-rent, some of the conditions being analogous to those of the feudal tenure of Europe. The fee remained in possession of the original grantee or his heirs. As time went on, these lesser parcels of land were again sub-divided, passing by conveyance, subject to ground-rent and other conditions, from one person to another until the liens and conditions upon them became intolerable, or at least they were deemed so; then followed a refusal to pay the rents and a denial of the validity of the original titles. A great amount of litigation ensued, resulting in a political contest which affected the whole State. These titles were, in fact, as good as any others; they originated, like all titles to land on the North American Continent, in grants from European Governments who had obtained dominion by right or wrong of possession and conquest; they were sustained by conveyances from the chiefs of Indian tribes who previously occupied the land, and claimed to own it in common. These deeds were obtained from Indian claimants by methods which were as fair as most of the dealings with the Indians; sometimes by force, sometimes by reasonably fair bargains, but always for a consideration bearing no sort of proportion to the value of the land itself after it came into the possession of the Europeans. It is probable that none but the chiefs had any share even in such consideration as was given:

These titles may be compared to the tenure of Irish lands now held by English owners, and also to those under which large estates in Great Britain have become vested in certain families by grants from kings after the confiscation of the abbey lands and monasteries; often obtained by force, by fraud, or by favouritism, rather than for any real service rendered either to the Crown or to the people.

In the course of events these conditions which were of a feudal nature, and the ground-rents on the New York manors held by the Patroons or by the descendants of the English grantees, became plainly inconsistent with the forms of society and the habits of thought of the people of this country. It may be held that since the private possession of land under the conditions of eminent domain, commonly called ownership, is subject to the power reserved in the right of eminent domain on the part of the Government, the only problem presented when existing forms of land tenure become adverse to the general or public interest is, how to change the conditions under which the land is thus possessed or held by private owners without injustice to them and without impairing the value of the capital which they have invested in the land or in the improvements by which it has been brought into use.

However well grounded in law the claims of the Patroons might have been, it became evident that some change must take place, as it is now apparent that some change must take place in Ireland. This

is proved by the fact that perpetual ground-rents are now prohibited by law in this country in most, if not all, of the States of the Union. In fact, ground-rents even for a fixed term of one hundred years, which are still permitted in many States, have become great obstructions to the progress of society. In the city of Boston, Mass., one considerable section, now in the heart of the city, is subject to a ground-rent for the unexpired term of the lease of one hundred years, executed early in the century. It is now covered by a rack of old buildings which it is for the interest of no one to replace with modern structures, and for many years they may stand as a menace to the neighbourhood by their very combustible nature, unless a destructive fire should haply or happily destroy only what ought to be removed. The great Boston fire came very near abating this nuisance, but unfortunately stopped on the wrong side of the street. In St. Louis a similar lease of a large tract of land has long obstructed the growth of the city on one side.

In the city of Philadelphia, on the other hand, the sale of land on a ground-rent has very long been a common practice; but it early appeared that perpetual ground-rents were inconsistent with true progress; they were therefore forbidden by law, leases terminable by payment of a lump sum or in instalments being substituted. The working people of Philadelphia are better housed than any similar population who dwell in any large city of this country. The reasons are not far to seek. The area over which the city of Philadelphia may extend is almost unlimited, and the people have become accustomed to certain municipal regulations, State laws and local institutions, which either differ in some measure from those in other cities, or else are better comprehended by the mass of the people who are subjected to their influence.

1. Local taxation for municipal purposes is practically limited to a single assessment upon the value of real estate, including both land and buildings. There are some minor taxes on plate and on franchises, but they are inconsiderable; machinery, tools, merchandise, stocks, bonds, ships, income, and other movable or personal property are wholly exempt from taxation.

2. Land is sold upon ground-rents terminable at a date fixed, or else, at the option of the lessee or grantee, by the payment of a lump sum or by partial payments.

3. Building societies, commonly called co-operative, have been developed in greater measure than in any other city in this country.

4. A well-devised Building Act, which has long been in force, requires that a given area of open space shall be maintained in ratio to the number of families which each dwelling is capable of sheltering, in all the sections which are mainly devoted to dwelling-house purposes.

5. Title insurance companies take charge of the examination of titles, and supervise the execution of the forms of conveyance at very moderate charges. For a small additional premium they will

insure the title to the grantee or his heirs so long as the estate is held under that specific conveyance. In this way the interests of the grantor and grantee of land, as well as of the citizen and the municipal corporation, are identified, and all conditions which might limit the use of land are removed. All the forces of society tend in the direction of housing the people in the most complete and most comfortable as well as in the safest and least costly manner. Character stands for more than capital. The artisan or mechanic who may have saved barely enough to furnish two or three rooms and buy some tools, can become the possessor in fee-simple of the land and dwelling in which these rooms are located, subject to a terminable ground-rent. Many of the richest manufacturers in Philadelphia began their married life in such a dwelling, working on a single hand-loom, free of taxation either on the loom, the stock woven upon it, or its product.

In a pamphlet lately published by the University of Pennsylvania, entitled *Ground-Rents in Philadelphia*, by Edward P. Allinson and Boies Penrose, members of the Philadelphia Bar, after giving the general facts, and especially the exact legal position of the ground-rents of Philadelphia, a new feature is brought into view—to wit, the plan adopted by the United Security Life Insurance and Trust Company of Philadelphia. “This company, incorporated with a capital of one million dollars, offers to loan up to eighty per cent. or more of the value of the property on a five, ten, or twenty year term; the scheme then provides for a mortgage by the purchaser to the company, with a policy of life insurance to be issued by the mortgagee company, the mortgagor agreeing to make monthly payments calculated on such a basis, that, if he lives out the term, he will pay off his principal, the amount of this payment including a premium on his life which covers the cost of insurance for that short term, so that, in the event of his death during the term, the property is handed over to the beneficiary clear of the mortgage. It is said that the insurance and payment amount to but a few dollars per month more than the rent would be, and that the purchaser gets his insurance as cheaply as he could buy it elsewhere.”

In this way a workman can assure a dwelling-place to his family, in case of his own death, by annual payments exceeding but little, if at all, the ordinary rent paid in many other cities upon simple leases of houses of the same kind.

The census of 1880 gives the following data:—

City of		Population.	Number of Dwelling-houses.
New York	. . .	1,206,299	... 73,684
Philadelphia	. . .	847,170	... 146,412
„ Boston	. . .	362,839	... 48,944
„ Chicago	. . .	503,663	... 61,069
„ Baltimore	. . .	332,313	... 50,833

These figures speak for themselves. The conditions are in part



due to the very narrow limits within which Boston and New York, for instance, have been constructed; the figures are in some degree fallacious, for the reason that there are very many structures in these two cities built in comfortable flats, each of which might be considered the equivalent of a separate dwelling-house; but on the whole it is very plain that the number of people living in separate houses owned or rented by themselves is greater in Philadelphia than in any other American city, and probably greater than in any other large city in the world. Baltimore comes next to Philadelphia, and the ground-rent system is also very common there.

This system of terminable ground-rents has thus far been applied almost wholly to city lots; lands devoted to agriculture have not as a rule been leased in this country, and the relation of landlord and tenant is not common in respect to farm land. The figures of the national census are somewhat fallacious on this point, because the coloured tenants on Southern plantations who work on shares are listed as tenant-farmers; also many market-gardeners are thus listed near the Northern cities, who work land which is leased to them only while it is held by the owner for the future extension of the city over it.

There are still a few tenant-farmers in the State of New York and also in the Western States, but it is at their own choice that they became so, for the reason that up to this date they could, and for many years to come they may, obtain land free of charge under the Homestead Act, if they desire to do so; they have elected to rent land already occupied because of its position, rather than become freeholders.

The Patroons who attempted to resist the anti-rent agitation were at last compelled to compound for a single payment, although their titles were unimpeachable in law. The form of tenure under which they held was, in fact, inconsistent with the free institutions of the country, and was not sustained by public opinion, which demands the simplest form of registered conveyance and free trade in land, and will not permit perpetual or obstructive encumbrances upon it.

As soon as the owners had compounded with their tenants, and had granted them clear titles on payment of an agreed sum, these titles were no longer disputed, and "*the Patroon's own title*" very soon became a synonym for the very best that could be obtained in the State.

Outside the crowded section of some of our great cities, not including Philadelphia, we therefore have few or no examples in this country of the contest of landlord and tenant, or the antagonism of interest between the owner and the occupant, such as now devastates Ireland, and is throwing good land out of cultivation in England.

May not the Irish land question, and the problem of how to remedy the existing depression in agriculture in Great Britain, perhaps be

solved by methods of relief based on the somewhat analogous cases in this country, instanced in York manors and the housing of the people of Philadelphia.

The Irishman is especially hungry for land. The Irish element in this country is largest in the State of Massachusetts. In the town in which the writer lives the population numbers about 10,000. The value of the real estate for purposes of taxation is about \$24,000,000 (say, approximately, £5,000,000), and while the writer can well remember when the first Irishman bought a lot of land in this town, which was then occupied mainly by a farming community, at the present time the owners of real estate whose names on the tax-list prove them to be of Irish birth or extraction number about 225, being about 25 per cent. of all the resident owners of real estate in the town, which is now a rich suburb of a great city.

Throughout the State of Massachusetts, Irishmen, who have saved and deposited their earnings in the savings banks while working as factory operatives, mechanics, or artisans, or, in much larger proportion, as common labourers; or else the immediate descendants of Irish emigrants, have for years been buying up the farms, and bringing them back into productive use, which the native young men left a generation since to take up the broader and more luxuriant fields of the far West.

It may perhaps be by a study of institutions and social forces which are thus converting the raw Paddy, who upon landing is prepared to vote against the Government as soon as he can do so, into a safe and conservative American citizen, dwelling happily in Puritan New England, that the land question of old Ireland can perhaps be settled. The study of these forces should not be obscured by the admitted fact that the lowest elements of Irish emigration may remain in the slums of the large cities to become the tools of the corrupt politicians by whom so much local misgovernment has been accomplished.

I know of no more effective charge of dynamite that could be sent from this side to the mother country than an account which a clever man could take down from the lips of one hundred or so prosperous Irishmen, now owners of real estate in this immediate vicinity, who were either compelled to emigrate from Ireland in the famine of 1846, or in the hard years subsequent thereto; or from men who are the sons of steerage passengers who landed here without a penny.

There are many other examples that can be cited indicating the manner in which a harmony of interest can be maintained between the occupant of land and the capitalist who lends the money by means of which the land is brought into use in our Western States; for instance, the methods of the land mortgage companies of this country are well-known to many English readers, several companies

of the like kind existing in Great Britain; but it may not have occurred to our British friends that an opportunity exists for the profitable organization of such companies for work nearer home. Through the intervention of these companies vast amounts of Eastern capital have been lent upon the security of the Western farms of the United States, the company interposing the guaranty of its capital between the lender and the borrower on a small margin of difference in the rate of interest on the secured bond, which is sold to the lender and the rate of interest paid by the borrower on the mortgage given on his specific farm.

The writer lately had occasion to compile the results of the business of several of the largest of these companies, who have lent during the present generation about \$280,000,000—a little under £200 sterling on each farm on the average—on 250,000 separate Western farms. This compilation disclosed the fact that there had been no net loss. The foreclosures have been few; some of the companies have met small losses, but, on putting together and summing up all the accounts, it proved that the profit from the sale of a part of the lands taken on foreclosure had fully offset the losses incurred in the other cases. The benefit to the borrowers is most strikingly illustrated in a recent official report of the State of Michigan. This State is situated about midway between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, consisting of a peninsula projecting northward between Lakes Huron and Michigan, containing 57,430 square miles, or a fraction less than the area of England and Wales. The State is rich in iron, copper, and timber, but it is mainly a farming State, producing a great excess of wheat, much of which is exported to Great Britain. It is now served by more than 5000 miles of railway.

The statistics of the farms which are mortgaged yield some of the most interesting economic results to the student.

In tables 1, 2, 3, and 4 of the compilation mentioned above the data are given in regard to 58 per cent. of all the farms of Michigan. The number covered by the tables is 90,803. The assessed value of these farms is \$194,854,633.

In a letter to the writer, the Commissioner states, that while the law of Michigan implies that the assessment is made upon the full value, it might well be assumed that the assessed value does not exceed 80 per cent. of the true value. If, then, we raise the value of the farms listed to a sum of which 80 per cent. would be the assessed valuation, we get the following results, omitting small fractions:—

Farms listed	90,803
Aggregate acreage	7,830,54
True value	\$243,568,291
Average size of farm	86½ acres
„ value per acre	\$31
of each farm, a little less than	\$2700

According to the census of the United States for 1880, 30 per cent. of the farms of Michigan were from 20 to 50 acres in area; 36 per cent. were from 50 to 100 acres; 30 per cent. were from 100 to 150 acres. The number of large farms in Michigan is very small.

There were 43,079 farmers in a total of 90,803 who stated that their farms were mortgaged; the greater part of the remainder stated that their farms were not mortgaged, and the few who refused to reply were listed with the latter. The Commissioner thinks the number under mortgage was about one-half, or 45,400, adding about 1500 for those who refused information.

The assessed value of the farms which were under mortgage was a fraction under \$80,000,000; raising this to full value gives the true value, \$100,000,000; aggregate of the mortgage debt, \$37,456,272; average rate of interest, 7.2 per cent.

On this basis, derived from 58 per cent. of the whole number of farms, the Commissioner estimates the assessed value of all the farms of Michigan at \$335,000,000; true value, \$420,000,000.

Assuming the same rate of mortgage on all farms as on those listed, the total mortgage indebtedness would come to \$65,000,000.

The further deduction is this, that the mortgages amounted to 19.2 per cent. upon the assessed value of all farms, which would give 17 per cent. on the full value of all farms; on those which are admittedly mortgaged, the mortgage comes to 46.8 per cent. of the assessed value, or 37½ per cent. of the full value.

The number of foreclosures in the year ending July 31, 1887. among the farms investigated—to wit, 90,803—was 1667. Of these 244 had been sold, 131 had been redeemed, and the rest were still subject to the proceedings in foreclosure. In one of the tables covering the same set of farms—to wit, 90,803 in number—84,488 are said to be occupied and worked by the owners, and 6815 occupied and worked by tenants. The number of permanent farm labourers is given at 25,717; the average wages of farm labourers per month, with board, is \$16.77. The price of transient labour occupied in the harvest season is not given in this report, but it is from \$1.50 to \$3 per day, the latter to engineers and managers of harvesting machinery.

These figures go far to justify the small proportion of hired labourers, as stated in the census of the United States, compared to the owners and occupants of the farms, less labourers in number than owners.

In a subsequent table given by the Commissioner, covering a somewhat larger number of farms in respect to the data given, some most interesting facts appear.

The number of farms treated is 94,949. Of these 31,570 were owned or occupied by foreigners; 63,379 were owned or occupied

by Americans. The foreigners were asked whether or not they had money when they arrived in the State; 8067 answered "Yes," and gave the sums of money in their possession when they arrived, amounting in the aggregate to \$4,633,188; 23,503 answered "No" to the question. The assessed value of the farms owned or occupied by these foreigners in 1887 was \$52,537,871, subject to a mortgage indebtedness of \$11,191,714.

Cash brought in . . . . .	\$4,633,188
Mortgage debt . . . . .	\$11,191,714

Total .	\$15,824,902
---------	--------------

Assessed value . . . . .	\$52,537,871
True value of farms . . . . .	\$65,672,333

This computation leaves to the owners of Michigan farms of foreign birth about \$50,000,000 as to their gain in real estate only. The question was not put to the Americans whether they had money or not when they arrived in the State.

Among the foreigners, the countries chiefly represented are as follows:—

Germany . . . . .	10,341	Ireland . . . . .	3,629
Canada . . . . .	8,225	Holland . . . . .	1,517
England . . . . .	4,182	Scotland . . . . .	1,027

The remainder came in smaller numbers from nearly all the countries of Europe, from the East Indies, Australia, Hayti, Mexico, and South America.

So much for what may be called economic studies connected with the land question in this country.

Our English cousins have the reputation among us of being a trifle slow, even in adopting beneficial changes. It has often been observed that, when social wrongs have nearly approached the point of revolution and violence, some method more or less logical has always been discovered in Great Britain for avoiding the danger. It puzzles us to understand the difficulty at the present time, as we witness the struggle of Parliament to maintain its control over the local affairs of the several sections of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. We find it hard to comprehend the aversion to Home Rule. To us, Home Rule and local self-government in all matters directly affecting the ordinary pursuits and the common welfare of the people are as necessary an element in our social and political life as the central power of the national Government is in its place. Home Rule and local self-government would be as sternly maintained, if threatened, as the national power was when the Southern States attempted to secede. The Southerners themselves have now found out that local self-government and Home Rule in a true sense were utterly inconsistent with the very existence of slavery; they have

therefore now discovered for themselves that they gained what they sought by losing what they fought for, and therefore their present loyalty cannot be questioned.

We GUESS, according to Yankee habit, that the people of England, notwithstanding the difficulties to which they themselves are now subjected in the tenure of English land, instinctively hold to the possession of land by private owners, subject to the conditions of eminent domain on the part of the State, as a social and economic necessity. We therefore GUESS that they fear that, if Home Rule were granted in the present condition of the Irish land question, it might be followed by such agrarian legislation as to bring about very dangerous conditions, so that the last state of poor Ireland would be worse than the first.

Hence the necessity of studying the land question in all its aspects before granting Home Rule, and hence also the attempt to fix rents by judicial process. This attempt was doomed to failure from the start by observers on this side, perhaps because it is not consistent with any true method of making use of land as an instrument of production. It gives no incentive to progress. Neither could judicial interference in contracts between landlord and tenant have been undertaken in this country, as it would be inconsistent with the terms of our written Constitution.

May it not be held that the true method of giving peace, order, and plenty to Ireland can only consist in giving the present occupants of the land such an interest in it as to make them as eager to pay their rent as they are now urgent in their refusal? May not such a course be taken as to render the occupants of the land of Ireland as ready to defend and maintain the titles derived from Cromwell and William of Orange as they are now to break them? May not these very titles become in the estimation of the people, like those of the present owners of the manors of New York State derived from the Patroons, "the best titles in the world"?

How shall this be undertaken? Is Ireland capable of supporting its people in comfort and welfare if this plan could be accomplished? Is it not true that under the wretched system of absentee-landlordism and rack-rented tenant-farming the land of Ireland yet produces an enormous excess of food which is exported and consumed in England? Has the limit of possible production either in quantity or in diversity ever been approached in Ireland? Is there any reason why the Irishman in Ireland should not be as successful a market-gardener and grower of all kinds of food as he is in New England and in many other parts of the United States? If not, what is lacking? Is it not the incentive of the actual or prospective ownership of the soil which he tills? Such would seem to be the solution of the question to one who studies the progress of the Irish in America towards wealth and welfare. None come among us who are more land-hungry

and none more safer citizens than the very men who, when in Ireland, have *there* attacked the present titles to land, when they themselves become the present possessors of land even in the smallest parcels *here*.

Let me then bring together in one plan the results which have been developed in the solution of the problems already considered and solved in this country.

It may be well to show how every tenant-farmer in England and every cottier or peasant in Ireland may become his own landlord; this may perhaps be accomplished by taking advantage of one trait in the English character which appears to be somewhat inconsistent with all the rest—to wit, the quickness with which a limited liability company can be organized, and the readiness with which capital can be secured for every conceivable purpose, and for some purposes which even to the Yankee mind are almost inconceivable. Yet it is entirely conceivable to us that a limited liability company should be formed, with ample capital, for the purpose of combining the functions of a title insurance company, a land mortgage company, and a terminable ground-rent company in one corporation.

Suppose such a limited liability company were organized, with a capital of £1,000,000, could not this capital be put to profitable use for the purchase of estates now out of cultivation, and laying them out in small parcels for sale on terminable ground-rents, the corporation giving guaranteed or insured titles? Would not this method offer a benefit to the promoters, both in the advance upon the price of land, which could not fail to rise when thus put in the way of the most productive use, and in a profit on the difference in the rate of interest or rent charged, and the rate on the bonds and securities sold with the guarantee of the corporation?

Is it reasonable that good land within fifty miles of the city of London should now be slow of sale at a less price per acre than land of a similar quality at the same distance from Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Milwaukee, or Detroit would quickly bring? Is not this undertaking one in which the so-called "Unionist" and the Home Ruler, the landlord and the tenant, the peer and the peasant, may all find a common ground for action, a common interest, and a common profit?

Can any one deny that if the lands of Ireland and England were cultivated with the assiduous industry which prevails in France, Germany, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, and the Channel Islands, sustained also by the intelligence and capital with which the high farming of the great estates of England is conducted, that crops of greater abundance and diversity might be grown than have ever yet been produced?

May not the two factors of labour and capital be reconciled when the interest of capital is secured by holding the fee of land leased

on a terminable ground-rent, and the interest of the occupant is also secured by the right to terminate the lease at his own option by payment of agreed sums? Does not the land itself, under such conditions, promise a much greater product, and therefore a better remuneration to the owner of the fee, to the tenant-farmer on a terminable ground-rent, and to the labourer alike, than each of them now obtains? May not their relations be changed and their interests become plainly identified instead of being apparently antagonistic as they now are?

Is not this more true of Ireland than of England? Perhaps no one in Ireland can realize what an Irishman can do with an almost hopeless piece of land, who has not witnessed a common Irish labourer, after his ten hours' work for wages are over, clearing the stones from a bit of rocky land near one of our New England cities, grubbing up the bushes, planting his little patch of potatoes for home use, or setting out his small fruits for sale, under the incentive of ownership, or in order to remove the mortgage on his freehold due to the neighbouring savings bank from which he has borrowed a part of the purchase money. Witness his penurious and intense labour in order that his well-clad children may attend the common schools and prepare themselves for the work of life in a way that has been denied to him. Englishmen who wonder at the sympathy of Americans for the Irish may well believe that we have been called upon to deal with an Irish question ourselves, and that we know something of the true, just and righteous method of solving it, by enabling the poorest to become owners of their homesteads if they will.

Except for the existence of such an Irish question in America, this treatise prepared by an American for an English magazine might perhaps be out of place.

The writer is aware that propositions have been submitted in Parliament for the Government of Great Britain to buy out landlords especially in Ireland, and to rent the land on terms corresponding in some measure to the propositions submitted in this article. Such a proposition would be considered wholly outside the true functions of government in this country, and would be doomed to failure from the beginning in the mind of almost every student of economic science; it being held that the purchase and sale of land, the settlement of rents, and the negotiations necessary to be made for the productive use of land, are wholly inconsistent with the true functions of government.

EDWARD ATKINSON.



## ECCE HOMO.

IN the preceding number of this REVIEW appeared an article entitled "We Fools of Nature," in which it was shown—(1) that man has been hitherto, and threatens to be for an indefinite time to come, a mere embryo of a person, a thing worked by instinct, not by will—puppet, dupe, and victim of unconscious forces; (2) that there is a way of escape from this infernal embryonism, and that it is the way indicated by Christ, "the way of the Cross." It was shown that, as regards beneficial progress, *natural* evolution has done its utmost, and is now urging man by torment to complete its work, to achieve its end, by *voluntary* evolution; the end being a reign of Will founded on organic moral goodness. Consciousness, including sentiment and motive, is an effect of the action of body on soul; and the specific attribute of bodies or organisms that cause Christ-like sentiment and motive, I call organic goodness. If the showing be true, it establishes that the idea of a Divine Creator and Providence is a delusion, and that, if it be essential to Christianity to uphold that idea, Christianity also is a delusion. But it has been shown that it is not essential to Christianity to uphold the idea; that, on the contrary, the idea has served as mere scaffolding, within which a temple has been built, the temple of the spirit of holiness and charity, of the Christian spirit. The purpose of this article is to pull down the scaffolding, display the temple, and thereby explain the architect.

Granting an insurrection against the sway of unconscious force to be possible, it is possible only in one way: the insurgent must have adopted a plan of life more or less opposed to his instincts, and be striving to conform to it. One may seem to himself to have so purposed, and to be striving accordingly, even with considerable self-denial, without having ceased to be puppet and dupe; all instincts, all faculties—indeed, all the principles that compose the nature of a man—are unconscious, and the apparent insurgent may be a mere puppet of the instinct ambition, or the instinct prudence; one or other of these may be working him all the time by means of the stronger motive, excluding the interference of Will while duping him with an appearance of choice and self-denial. But our liability to be deceived in this way does not suppose the impossibility of a purpose and strife against instinct, one in respect of which we are

not puppets and dupes, and my contention is merely that only in the form of such a purpose and strife is insurrection against the sway of unconscious force possible. To know this is no small gain to those who have it in them to be resolutely averse to the condition of puppet and dupe; without it, they could not stir against the enemy.

Evolution seems to have been arming the conscious mind for the subjugation of its Titans, the unconscious forces. (1) It has developed conditions of self-knowledge in this nineteenth century vastly exceeding what existed before. Analytic display of human character seems to be the principal business of philosophy, history, romance and art. Look where we will in these directions, we are looking into a mirror held up to nature—one in which we must be dull indeed if we do not see somewhat of an image of ourselves. And it is probable that this importunateness of evolution to have us know ourselves has not been ineffectual; it is probable that the majority of the cultivated know their own propensities. (2) It has exposed the fact that human consciousness is an effect of unconscious corporal event, and has exposed the difference between Will and intentional instinct. It shows that, according to the moral faculty, it is the duty of Will to endeavour to destroy the instinctive force of the propensities, and reduce them to mere sources of motive, and, intrenching itself in wisdom, whereof holiness and charity (reverence and benevolence) are the cardinal constituents, substitute a reign of personality for that of instinct. (3) Evolution, modified by Christian charity, has so purified the moral faculty, that, when at its best, the faculty sees in retribution not justice, but revenge, and in fierceness a swinish quality which not even, as indignation, its championship of moral goodness can humanize, nor, as warrior, its connection with courage and fortitude glorify. So long as we are in bondage to the military spirit, capable of honouring fierceness in any form, so long are we necessarily puppets and dupes of unconscious forces; for, the magnanimity which Christianity calls meekness, and more generally humility, is the foundation of personality: a reign of Will is incompatible with the palsy called highmindedness. Not without a significance unintelligible till the nineteenth century did Christ assign to meekness or gentleness the first place among the beatitudes.

The purpose and strife essential to insurrection against the sway of unconscious force must be purpose and strife to conform to some model of human character. That it should be the model approved by the moral faculty of the insurgent, no one, I take it, will dispute. It would be silly to be at war with one's conscience when at war with instincts that are all but omnipotent. Moreover, it will appear that the type of character which the moral faculty at the height of culture approves is mainly, if not wholly, made up of constituents that are conditions *sine qua non* of a reign of Will—a hope-inspiring

fact, as testifying that Nature, for all its infernality, is profoundly and aboriginally bent on an apotheosis of what is divine in it—on raising into sovereignty what has been hitherto its impotent divine. The impotence was manifested nineteen hundred years ago by that spectacle on Calvary—the *λογος* hanging on a cross between two thieves. Says Nature to her human puppets—"I mean ye to be persons: I cannot of myself—without your voluntary and self-denying co-operation—accomplish this change, but I am evolving the needful knowledge and motive, and will sooner or later evolve the needful magnanimity—the needful courage and fortitude." Let us examine the model in which the moral faculty at its best must see consummate beauty and no blemish. But the term, moral goodness, denotes nothing intelligible if the belief that man is a mere series like the human body (like a wave or a flame) whisk away the possibility of a subject of goodness, the possibility of a good agent. If man have not a soul as well as a body, be not a durable subject of consciousness and Will, he can neither be morally good nor morally evil. We must therefore begin by establishing that man consists of soul as well as body. Now, this has been done for us by the treatise called *L'Alternative*. It is mainly, from beginning to end, an argument to prove that the cardinal part of the human being is a simple substance, so durable that, according to the axiom "*ex nihilo nihil fit*," it could not begin or end; that what begins and ends in man is the union of this simple substance, monad or atom, with a body or organism; that the cardinal monad is exclusively the subject of consciousness and of the attribute called Will, and that it depends for consciousness, and therefore for all sentiment and motive, good or evil, on the action upon it of the connected organism; that, as free agent, it has power, not only to prevent bad propensity from determining behaviour, but, by applying a certain discipline, to modify the organism so as to enfeeble the bad and strengthen the good propensities, and, through the principle of heredity, augment this power in progeny. The following is a summary of the argument:—

Belief is comprised by that which does and that which does not begin in inference—inferential and uninferential belief. The objects of the latter are called "*natural data*." Of these, some are, and some are not, fundamental in respect of the system of human beliefs. That the apparent persons, A, B, and C, seen by D, are real, is an example of *natural data* that are not fundamental. The *data*, that something exists besides Ego and what it includes, that Ego is a durable thing, that things equal to the same are equal to one another, are examples of fundamental *natural data*. All inferential beliefs depend on fundamental *natural data*. To deny the validity of the mind *quod* source of fundamental *natural data*, is to deny the validity of Reason and of evidence and the legitimacy of belief. This we do

implicitly when we deny a consistent natural *datum*. Common sense, duly enlightened, turns its back on such a negation. Yet, according to experience, we are liable to fundamental natural *data* that are untrue. This makes a dilemma: but common sense knows how to deal with it. Reason is very fallible, but common sense does not therefore depose it; on the contrary, holds to it as a *pis aller*: so it holds to the *datum*-giving faculty as regards consistent fundamental natural *data*. It regards the negation of such a *datum* as absurd—all the more if the *datum* be an axiom. Now, that man is a durable thing, is a consistent fundamental natural *datum*, and since his body is a mere series, there must be a durable part of him that is not his body. This part is necessarily a substance and a subject of consciousness; it must be a simple substance, for consciousness is axiomatically given as being attribute of a simple substance. This substance is what is called soul. The human composite of which it is a part begins and ends, but there can be no beginning or end of a simple substance.

Then, as regards Will and its freedom—their existence is guaranteed by a consistent fundamental natural *datum*. Therefore the argument has not to prove the existence of free will; it has merely to refute certain objections to the possibility of choice, and this it does. It shows (1) that a choice is a preference of one of two opposite motives, either of which the agent was free to prefer: the choice differs from the preference only as including the freedom of the agent to prefer the other motive; (2) that choice does not presuppose an infinite regress of causations, each a volition; (3) that it is a rational act, that the agent prefers not only one of two opposite motives, but also one of two opposite reasons of choice; (4) that Will never acts, nor passively permits, save when it is challenged by the feeling of duty, that it leaves all other human action to intentional instinct, that opposition of dignity to greater desirableness is a *sine quâ non* of choice, and that to allege against choice the pretext that the idea of preference of the weaker motive is inconsistent is a mere *petitio principii*; (5) that volition does not suppose an isolation of the mind, or of any part of it, in indifference; (6) that so far from being the necessary sequent of the last judgment of the understanding, volition is never the immediate sequent of a judgment; (7) that it is in perfect agreement with physical science, especially as regards the subjection of Cosmos to law, with the theory of the conservation of force, with the predictableness of human behaviour, with sociology and reflex action.

But a strange thing has happened, at least to those of us who have seriously questioned the deliverances of the mind *quâ datum*-giving faculty, respecting the durability and free agency of Ego.<sup>1</sup> Question

<sup>1</sup> I purposely omit the definite article before the term Ego.

seems to have killed, at least paralysed, our primitive certitude respecting them, so that it is not revived by refutation of objections. We seem to have been pushed out of the nest of certitude, and to be on the wing in the seeming void of mere opinion, having need of arbitrary interference with the function of Reason to keep ourselves from falling into Pyrrhonism. Some of us, using the wing automatically as we use our lungs, are ignorant of the arbitrariness, but others, of keener discernment, are aware of the arbitrariness which keeps them in the region of opinion. They know that they are helping themselves by what *L'Alternative* calls the arbitrium—a decree that such or such an opinion is reliable. We have been pushed out into scepticism, but not necessarily into Pyrrhonism. Common sense saves the bulk of us from that by *faith*, faith in the truthwardness of the mind; wherefore our scepticism may be called common-sense scepticism.

According to common-sense scepticism, the better opinion is that man is a compound of soul and body; that the soul is a simple substance, subject of consciousness and free agent; that it is dependent for consciousness, and therein for all sentiment, motive, and discernment, on the action upon it of the body; that, as regards intentional action, when duty does not challenge the interference of Will, it is a necessary agent, and that it is possible for it, when duly admonished by the feeling of duty, to conform behaviour, to moral goodness, and even modify the body so as to improve it, *quod* source of sentiment and motive.

Now, what is the type of character that should serve as goal to our effort to escape from the condition of puppet? (1) The animus it typifies must be founded on conquest; for congenital moral goodness is merely instinctive: it either excludes Will or holds it in abeyance; we are as much puppets when worked by good instincts as when worked by bad ones. The idea of a perfect human nature that exempts its subject from temptation and need of recusant volition is one that does not bear examination; the best possible human nature, at least the best conceivable, is one in which anarchic force bears to Will such a relation as chaotic force in the material world bears to cosmic force. Throughout eternity, if man be immortal, he will have to maintain the ascendancy of Wisdom and Will by effort—a destiny less repugnant, at least from the *a priori* point of view, than one that excludes occasion of voluntary action. (2) The propensities of the kind of man typified are not instinctive; they are temperate enough to be mere sources of motive, not of an intensity to make them insubordinate to Will—intense only when Will permits. (3) The perfect man is devoid of self-love—that is, of pride, vanity, and self-esteem. (4) He is incapable of anger, scorn, sarcasm, derision, malicious wit, depreciation of the neighbour in any form not demanded by duty. (5) He is of a self-sustained erectness, leaning on no person or

society; not, through vanity and pride, on the world's opinion, nor, through fondness, on the love and companionship of a person. His love of persons, free from the infirmity of fondness, is purely beneficent, in no degree self-seeking. (6) He loves his neighbour as himself, sees in him an inalienable sacredness, even in the wicked and fatuous, and apprehends injury to the neighbour not required by duty as sacrilege. (7) He is capable of austerity against himself and others in the service of duty. (8) He has a masterly knowledge of human nature which makes him strong against imposture; is earnest to augment man's power over nature by science. He pursues happiness—*i.e.*, pleasure compatible with moral goodness—delights in innocent festivity, in wit, humour, beauty, art. Knowing the antecedents through which nature has evolved him and the danger of reversion, he is diligent, in the interest of his race as well as of himself, to maintain his advantage, his muscular as well as his mental perfection.

Note that humility, holiness, and charity compose, in the perfect man, the support and condition *sine quâ non* of a regnant Will. Humility is privation of self-love, anger, and all intensity. Holiness is what *L'Alternative* calls adult reverence—*i.e.*, reverence whereby the subject apprehends injustice as sacrilege, and sees in the neighbour, however wicked or weak, a sacredness he could not violate without a pain which no profit arising from the violation could compensate. Charity is *essentially just benevolence*—benevolence incapable of generating an unjust motive<sup>1</sup>—*modified by holiness, and strong enough to counteract, in the sphere of motive, the self-regarding principles.* On reverence depends intuition of human dignity, and on holiness such intuition of human dignity as is needful to make life worth living because of the preciousness of human intercourse. The poverty of the intercourse of the vulgar, on account of its lack of respect, is flagrant: it shows by contrast the indispensableness of holiness to the perfect human character. That of charity needs no proof. But the virtue of humility is by no means obvious. How should it be since it is made up of two species, one abject, the other noble, and the two are commonly confounded. Abject humility hangs upon its noble congenr, like rags upon the Apollo Belvedere. It is determined by moral idiotcy or tolerant cowardice. Noble humility is exemption of a person from certain vile attributes, *viz.*, irascibility, pride, vanity, self-esteem, and eagerness—eagerness of propensity that excludes regnant voluntariness, and therein person-

<sup>1</sup> "Altruism is essentially just when it is of a nature incapable of generating an unjust motive. Parental altruism is of a nature to teem injustice. Patriotic altruism tends to generate the unjust sentiment, "my country right or wrong." Altruism towards friends or those who are attractive to us inclines us to be unjust to those who are at variance with them. But in the altruism of the good Samaritan, of Christian charity, there is no such tendency. It is no respecter of persons, will go out of its way to succour an enemy as well as a friend. This pure benevolence, which Christ would have paramount, though by no means to the exclusion of the opposite species, is co-extensive with all conscious being. It is the love of the neighbour, of mankind, enjoined in the eleventh commandment."

ality. Without it there can be no nobleness, no magnanimity, for how should a puppet be noble? Cleanse the terms humility and meekness from the soil they have incurred from association with the abject species. Better do this than by the invention and use of new names for what they denote, for example the "sweet reasonableness" of the late Mr. Arnold, indulge a stultifying fastidiousness. By this hardy exercise, you will burnish the words of Christ respecting the beatitude, meekness; they will become to you aglow with commendation of heroism and implicit injunction to become to yourself a purgatory that shall cleanse you of baseness. Behaviour according to humility is such a purgatory. The agent undergoes an excruciating consciousness of meanness, a consciousness imposed upon him by pride—scorn of himself as something less than a worm; for, the worm, when trod upon, turns. In vain shall he intellectually know that, in this scorn, highmindedness is scorning magnanimity; the heart will work as though the knowledge did not exist, will writhe in self-contempt all the same. The agent will be contemptible to others as well as to himself. Even those who know the reason of his behaviour can have no cordial feeling of its dignity; through stupidity of heart they must regard him as a mere imitator, and probably a bad one, of virtue. He must often welter in the fire of suppressed anger. He must live an artificial life, live in all but continual recollection, in order to prevent egotism and fierceness—to prevent convulsion—and so ultimately undo the bearing of the natural language of provocation on his heart. All this, without guarantee of experience that, in respect of it, nature will accommodate to practice, that anything more can come of it than accommodation of behaviour to duty, *pro hac vice*. Contrast what commonly passes for manliness with that of the insurgent against the infernal in nature—puppet manliness with Christian manliness. So long as moral taste can keep itself soaring in the light of reason, Christian manliness must seem to it to be as adamant and fierce maunliness as pottery.

Of course, it is now obvious that what reason finds to be the only conceivable way of escape into regnant personality is the way indicated and first travelled by Christ, "the way of the Cross." Now, why did not Christ expose the baseness and wretchedness of man's puppet condition and urge revolt? Because of the omnipotent pusillanimity of the race until it acquire the Christian spirit. The fisher of men—He who was to make Peter a fisher of men—was no mere Socrates or Plato, no dupe of the idea that an exposure of the baseness and wretchedness of human condition could move men to attempt the ordeal of fire that divides them from regnant personality. He knew that the human heart must be altered before such an exposure could find in it the needful magnanimity, must have a germ of affection to wisdom developed in it to a point at which it is

a nascent chrysalis, ascetically yearns for completeness, for separation from its larve. Wisdom, and this embryo of wisdom, I call the Christian spirit; in the natural celibate, it is what the Roman Catholic Church calls vocation: it differentiates a species of man named by *L'Alternative*, "natural priest." Christ made it the keystone of Christendom. It is what he calls "the salt of the earth." The longing of the natural priest is the wealth that warrants the undertaking to build the tower, the force that warrants resistance to the hostile king.<sup>1</sup> Unlike the young man who had kept the Commandments from his youth upwards, was a good natural layman, it can inspire its subject to sell all he has, give to the poor, and follow Jesus.<sup>2</sup> The natural priest is the fuel of the Christian Church; but there was danger that clods would be thrown on the sacred fire instead of fuel: this befell, and the *vis medicatrix* of the Church saved it by a split—the Reformation. Now, how was Christ to develop in man the Christian spirit?

If he could do it supernaturally, miraculously—*i.e.*, without the use of means—it would be unworthy to have recourse to means; and to have recourse to slow and painful means would be cruel as well as absurd. If omnipotence exempted Jehovah from need to employ means, the Fall and the Atonement were shams and wanton cruelties—cruelties to be expected from the creator of the predatory system, but not from a divine father. Caprice is unseemly. It is inconsistent to ascribe it to a rational being, and sacrilegious to ascribe it to a divine one. But what is more capricious than the thing called grace, especially sensible grace? Its caprices rival those of the wind. Now it floods the heart, now leaves it as dry as Sahara. The spiritual distinguish it from what they call "solid virtue"—*i.e.*, from the stable second nature that results from Christian discipline. They speak of the "first fervours" of the novice as being "sugar plums for children." With like irony, the *Imitation of Christ* remarks: "They ride pleasantly enough who are borne by grace."<sup>3</sup> Think of an act of God inflating the breast and sides of St. Philip Neri so as to break one of his ribs, or instigating the disorderly behaviour of prophets and speakers of unknown tongues, behaviour which elicited the remonstrance of St. Paul. If we suppose grace to be a behaviour of Nature divinely caused—caused either by a divine person other than the subject or by the impersonal divine, its caprice is intelligible. It is intelligible, as being in part palsy incident to the interference of the infernal in Nature. Fact shuts us in to the conclusion that the Divine, whether personal or impersonal, is not omnipotent in the sense of being exempt from need to employ means. Christ had to stoop to the employment of means.

<sup>1</sup> Gospel according to St. Luke, xiv. 27–32.

<sup>2</sup> Gospel according to St. Matthew, xix. 21.

<sup>3</sup> *Imitation of Christ*, Book ii. chap. ix.



Here I have to assail a noble and useful prejudice. As a rule, deception is unjustifiable, but there are circumstances—they are not uncommon—that make it a duty to deceive. It is a duty to humour the insane, and to deceive the timid patient. A stage manager appeared before the curtain one evening, and, with a coolness that deceived the audience and froze its panic tendency, said, “We have all but suppressed a fire behind the scenes, but nevertheless it may be prudent to retire.” He saved the majority, but he himself perished with many who made up the rear of the departing crowd. He was aware when enacting the deception that he was giving time to the flames to get between him and the rear entrance of the theatre. Was he a culprit or a hero? A father saved an infant son from an insane mother, who, having the infant in her arms, said, “I shall throw baby out of the window.” “No,” said he, “let me.” Should the son, when adult, condemn the father for having saved him by a deception? It appears then that, in certain exceptional circumstances, end justifies means. The moral faculty sees pedantry in a scruple that would hesitate to avert a great calamity by a deception. Let us suppose that Nature evolves a man of such aptitude for the attainment of moral perfection that he acquires it while still adolescent, and by the light of the contrast between his own nature and that of all other living men, he sees that they are weltering in an infernal embryonism from which they may be rescued by a deception. To save them, he must give himself to them as son of God, humour their conviction of sin, persuade them that by immolating himself on a cross he atones for sin, and have himself scourged, mocked, howled at, spat upon, and crucified. If heroism can be a duty, it would be obviously the duty of such a man to save his race by the deception. Not only would the end justify the means, it would entitle the victim to the adoring gratitude of mankind for ever.

It was possible for Christ to start a process in Palestine that would in time organize the Christian Church, and so generate and foster the Christian spirit. This he could do—(1) by the exercise of an unparalleled magnetic power such as obliged the sordid Matthew to follow him at a call, imposed the hallucination known as the transfiguration and that other in which he appears walking on the water, healed certain diseases, amongst them what passed for “possession” (the power tempted him to make himself Cæsar, and he answered, “Get thee behind me, Satan!”) (2) By enjoining on his followers to live according to meekness, holiness, and charity. (3) By the doctrine of vicarious atonement and apparently ransoming mankind by his blood from the penalty of sin due to divine justice (the doctrine involves that of heaven and hell). (4) By appearance of miracle. He might thus apply the potent instincts—godliness, hope, and fear—against self-love and fierceness, and to the development of reverence

and benevolence—of holiness and charity. Unconscious force, passing for will, would mainly sway the movement, but the soul as Will would sometimes interfere. The development of charity would, sooner or later, make the doctrine of hell repugnant, and expose the error that retribution is a species of justice. Science would, sooner or later, expose the falseness of the Mosaic cosmogony, and philosophy that of the idea of a Creator and Providence. The sway of unconscious force would be exposed. Then would the enlightened Christian spirit discern a new meaning in the deliverances of Christ, and see, in what would then be commonly held to be orthodox Christianity, a mere scaffolding wherewith a temple had been built. Consider well that Christianity would itself contribute to expose the deception it was for a time to involve: it even obscurely predicted the strife that was to obtain when Christian charity could no longer endure the doctrine of hell—a strife that would all but trample Christianity to death. “The gates of hell shall not prevail against it” (Matt. xvi. 8). Such was the problem that fact put to Christ when experience ripened him to discern the difference between the personal and the impersonal man, between, on the one hand, the divine man with Will intrenched in humility, holiness, and charity, and, on the other, the puppet, dupe, and victim of unconscious force. Was he at the instance of self-love to make himself Cæsar, or die ignominiously to assimilate to himself, and so save, mankind? A throne or a cross? He chose the cross, had himself lifted up that he might draw all men to him, and by this means founded Christendom.

It seems then that the way of salvation and the only one discoverable by Reason is the very way of salvation indicated by Christ. Reason apprehends it as a way of escape from the dominion of unconscious force. Christ represented it as being a way of escape from sin and from a penalty arbitrarily annexed to sin by divine justice. The fisher of men was bound to bait the prehensile with which he was to rescue, conformably to the appetite of godliness and to the conviction of sin wherewith their wire-puller duped them. But what sanction have I for the apparent sacrilege of imputing what seems to be atheism to Christ, and the employment of bad means for a good end? My chief sanction is that to hold the contrary would be to imply that Christ was a puppet and a dupe of unconscious force. This is the sum of several sanctions which I shall now adduce.

1. It is demonstrable that the idea of a Creator is inconsistent. The idea is absurd as well as inconsistent. It is repugnant to the enlightened moral faculty. It is refuted by the discovery that what is called design is a product of unconscious force. It implicitly contradicts the axiom, “*Ex nihilo nihil fit*,” for the idea of a volition followed by the emergence of something out of nothing is inconsistent. Some philosophers, to save the theistic theory, pretend that Cosmos was evolved out of a personal substance by a volition of the

person. Such an evolution would not be a creation. The beginnings and ends of bodies, unexplained antecedently to science as being due to aggregation and segregation of atoms or molecules, suggested the inconsistent idea of creation, which, taking root in reverence, became strong enough to survive the discovery of its inconsistency. Another objection to the idea of a Creator is that the idea supposes him to have passed a pre-eternity in idleness and mere vacuity, and that the creative act was a caprice; for, he could have no reason for creating at a given time which was not valid for previous creation. Moreover the idea of a creator supposes what it symbolizes to be subject to nature; subject, for example, as regards its existence—for, the idea of self-creation is inconsistent; subject as regards the attribute, free agency, if the idea suppose God to be a free agent. If God exists, he exists of necessity, and if he be a free agent, he is necessarily a free agent—as regards these two necessities, he is a mere part of nature; if the idea symbolize him as being good, it supposes him to be, as regards the attribute goodness, a necessary or natural subject. Then if God be good, he must be subject to emotion, for emotion is essential to goodness, and in all probability (though I do not now insist on this) to free agency. The moral faculty protests that the idea of God is a sacrilege—that, to ascribe the existence of such a world as experience shows ours to be to a divine being, is to profane the spirit of holiness. The Holy Ghost within us, pointing to the predominance of evil in being, denies creation. How should a divine being choose to connect with free agency in man a nature which a bad volition could corrupt, how choose to create all conscious things on the predatory scheme? The argument that the incomprehensibility of the putative creator disqualifies man to judge that there was no creation is a *petitio principii*: it begs the existence in question and begs the incomprehensibility. The discovery that there is an unconscious part of the mind, and that consciousness is effect of unconscious corporal processes, refutes what is called the argument from design: I have shown that design itself is an effect of unconscious force. I now appeal to the spirit of holiness in man that he whom it regards as Saviour was not dupe of an inconsistent, absurd, and morally repugnant idea, and to common sense that the founder of Christendom was not a dupe.

2. Christianity implies by its recourse to natural means that the divine is not omnipotent. If it were, a *fiat* would suffice to redeem mankind, and recourse to Calvary would be an impious masquerade. The existence of evil supposes that the divine is not omnipotent. Godliness denies the truth of this apparent axiom, alleging that the seeming of inconsistency of the opposite is due to the weakness of our knowing faculty, which prevents it from discerning a reason, according to which evil should exist in a universe created by an omnipotent and divine creator. Desperate indeed must be a cause

that has recourse to such an argument, one that puts reason itself out of court. If seeming of inconsistency be questionable, reasoning has no validity. For some inscrutable reason, forsooth, the axiom that the sum of the parts is equal to the whole may not be true. The argument is as available to Fetichism as to Theology. Christian reverence dare not ascribe to Christ the irrationality evinced by such an argument: it can allow, on the ground that end justifies means, that he availed of the tendency of reverence to hold to what it prizes in spite of contradiction, and even glorify the tenacity, as in the deliverance of St. Augustine, "*Credo quia absurdum*," but not that Christ was the dupe of a fanatical godliness.

3. I have abundant sanction in the deliverances of Christ, deliverances, which allow a dominion of Nature that excludes divine omnipotence. "I have yet many things to say unto you, but you cannot bear them now" (St. John's Gospel, xvi. 7). A divine omnipotence, intent upon making itself known through Christ to man, yet unable to modify the minds of the faithful so as to enable them to receive all the knowledge it was desirable to impart! The words imply that there is to be a development of Christian knowledge, and this expressly put in the succeeding verse: "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth." The spirit of truth, the spirit of holiness, the Holy Ghost, the Christian Spirit, the Comforter, Wisdom, the attribute denoted by all these names, will complete in you my gospel, of which I can now impart to you only a germ. This it will do when belief in hell, convulsed by Christian charity, is threatening Christianity, and science is washing away the soil of godliness from the roots of Christianity. It will then explain that, in spite of the inconsistency and absurdity of the doctrine that Nature is the creature of a divine omnipotent creator, who so created man that he could be corrupted by the eating of an apple, and that a multitude of men would deserve and incur eternal torment—in spite of all this, and much more, as repugnant to reason and the moral faculty, Christ is the *λογος* and the saviour of mankind; that he was the first to travel and indicate the only way of escape discernible by reason from an infernal embryonism in which men are continually torturing each other.

In the Gospel according to St. Mark, iv., the dominion of Nature that excludes divine omnipotence is plainly put. It plainly implies that Nature is, in various kinds of men, impregnable to supernatural power, in some through hardness of heart, in others through insufficiency of the soil needful for the growth of moral goodness. This is corroborated by Christ's injunction not to cast pearls before swine (St. Matt. vii. 6). In connection with the parable of the sower, Christ makes a remark that seems to be contrary to the Christian spirit, until its significance is elucidated by the new interpretation which reconciles the gospel with science. It is this: "But unto them

that are without, all these things are done in parables, that seeing they may see and not perceive, and hearing they may hear and not understand; lest at any time they should be converted and their sins should be forgiven them." Man, according to Christ, was a mere puppet, and therefore incapable of sin, but could be lured along the way of salvation by a doctrine representing him to himself as a sinner doomed to eternal punishment except he repented. In the quoted locution he aggravates repugnancy to the Christian spirit in order to signify to the nineteenth century what was meant to be previously unintelligible, that the infernal in nature had made deception a *sine qua non* of salvation, and that Christ had applied it.

# ANGLOPHOBIA IN THE UNITED STATES.

## A REPLY.

MR. BROOKS entirely misses the moral his article should teach. Let me draw it.

Like Mr. Brooks, I left England for the United States in August 1888. Since my arrival in the United States I have moved over a wide range of territory; I have had exceptional opportunities of getting at the sentiments of all classes of "Americans"; and I have, to the best of my ability, used my opportunities. Unlike Mr. Brooks, I still remain in the United States, in which I have, for the ends of a critic, some advantage over him.

First impressions, and noonday impressions—and in the political world noonday may be considered as covering the whole electioneering period—are most vivid. Such impressions are, however, not always accurate: they are seldom philosophic.

Let me commence by saying that my own first impressions (political) in the United States were most painful. As an Englishman proud of my country, and not least proud of the work accomplished upon this great continent by sons of British sires, our American cousins, I everywhere unhesitatingly proclaimed my nationality, and emphasized the fact of kinship. Full of the idea of England being the land of Hampden, where the first resounding blow was struck for liberty (which, by comparison, is so much more easily inherited than gained)—full of the idea that England was the birthplace of the Pilgrim Fathers and of a sterner race who remained at home, painfully to fight out a long fight, against wicked men, more obdurate than nature in her most rugged aspects—full of the idea that England was the living home of discovery, invention, and enterprise that made the world what it is to-day—full of these ideas and of others, certainly not ignoble, that make an Englishman proud, to the innermost core of his heart, of his country, I came to the United States as one claiming by right the sympathy of those I regarded as joint inheritors in the great past. That sympathy I did not receive as an Englishman. To say that I was indignant is inaccurately to express my feelings: I was dumfounded. But I have since recovered. After all, matters are not so bad as they seem.

It is quite evident to me that the ordinary American does not.

VOL. 131.—No. 3.

understand what constitutes the truly "English"; and I am myself too genuinely English to take offence over what I am convinced is a misconception. Americans have been accustomed to hear confused noises coming across the ocean—(English Jingoism certainly are the very deuce for making and keeping up noises)—and they innocently enough suppose *that* to be "English."

I have no cause to complain of my personal welcome in the United States: few Englishmen have. Americans are essentially a kindly and accessible people. When, however, I have sought, as no doubt others have sought, to go behind my personal welcome and to refer it to the fact of my being an Englishman, I have been promptly undeceived. If Americans entertain any particular regard for Great Britain, and I think they do, they certainly do not pin it, so to speak, upon their coat-sleeves. Meanwhile Americans resolutely, and even ostentatiously, insist upon drawing a wide distinction between welcome to the individual and welcome for a nation. The frame of mind that induces them—a people curiously and wonderfully sensitive—to act thus is not, I fancy, altogether unknown in England, where, indeed, there exists quite a cult against the "too damned sentimental."

Pointed reference has been made to the latest American catch-saying, "It's English, you know." We are told this sneer was "more effective than argument, as it appealed to the selfishness and to the prejudices of the people." Catch-sayings usually are, with the many, more effective than argument: at least, I know it was so when I left England. When, however, Mr. Brooks proceeds to talk about "selfishness" and "prejudices" in connection with the United States, I cease to understand him. When a nation of sixty-five millions accepts a half-million immigrants every year, practically without inquiry, such terms are grotesquely out of place. If this is what passes with Mr. Brooks for argument, I should say the less we have of it the better. I confess the refrain, "It's English, you know," considering the kind of stuff that precedes it, is far from pleasant to English ears. Yet if the words, with their context, be regarded philosophically, I am not sure that they do not offer legitimate food for wholesome reflection.

The young bloods of Whitechapel and of St. James's have for a long while been raising the welkin to the cry, "It's British, so British, you know," only to another tune to that at present so popular in the United States. If Englishmen think it "British" to brag and bluster, and to scoff at the claims of a common humanity as "sickly sentimentality"—so it must be. But in that case it is unbecoming to complain of Americans for saying that "brag" and "bluster" and "inhumanity" are "English, you know." By all means let us remove, if we can, the American "mote," but do not let us therein

altogether overlook the English "beam." After all, the offending words are little more than a music-hall jingle; no better and no worse than a score of jingles such as London nightly delights in. The offence of the American jingle, I fear, lurks in its superior appropriateness. English cocks of the dunghill strut like peacocks and English jackasses get into the lion's skin and bray—and Americans sneer. The initial fault is with England's too patient manhood for having so long tolerated such ignoble doings.

Having expended much indignation upon a topical song, Mr. Brooks proceeds to declare that "probably there is no nation on earth towards which Americans use such indecent and insulting language, and use it seemingly with delight, as they use towards the English." Assuredly it is so. But the impartial historian might have explained that such language is more than paralleled by that of the leaders of the "Gentlemanly party" when speaking of her Majesty's liege subjects of Ireland and of India—"Hottentots" and "black men." Much of the verbal licence complained of comes of Americans following all too closely high English examples. They accept the ruling of London with most ingenuous frankness. Now, the first rules of the game of foreign policy, as printed at Printing House Square and at Fleet Street, and published at Westminster, is that, in her external relations, a nation cannot afford to have senses or affections, a conscience or a heart, and that "greed," "selfishness," and "brutality" are pieces to be pushed well to the front. These are the authorized rules now accepted by Jingoese throughout the world.

It may be pleaded that Americans play a rude game with quite unnecessary rudeness: that they pay too great attention to force of language, and no regard whatever to form. Granted. American blackguardism is the more crude, English blackguardism the more venomous. The choice being between evils, the question is which kind of blackguardism is preferable? Not being an expert in such matters, I shall not attempt to determine so nice a point. I may, however, without unduly intruding upon the decision of the qualified, here humbly unburden myself of a sentiment. I confess I have always recoiled, and do still recoil, from those pictures of classic degradation which depict an effete people, once rulers of the world, as laying down yellow sand in the gladiatorial arena in order to conceal stains of blood, and then watering it with rosewater to make butchery more odorous and to keep down troublesome dust. Perfumed brutality is the luxury of expiring empires, not of vigorous democracies. The more the approach to the battle-field is made to resemble the thing approached—a shambles—the better for humanity. At present, diplomacy and war are too much regarded in the light of gentlemanly pastimes for swell loungers, with jaded appetites, to pursue in search of excitement. When democracies take to discussing vigorously their own affairs, fastidious villany may perhaps retire



in disgust. Best, so. The custom of treating your neighbour as a dog, and occasionally so calling him, has not a democratic origin. Democracies have no interest in keeping alive national antipathies.

Mr. Brooks says Mr. Blaine's chief stock-in-trade as a Republican electioneering agent was "abuse of England;" and proceeds to blame him for appealing to the "passions, the prejudices, the most sordid qualities of American electors: he touched no subject without degrading it; a more shameless display of grovelling selfishness was never presented to the world, by any man making pretensions to statesmanship." Mr. Brooks is unjust. He patriotically overlooks certain political manoeuvres in what Swift sardonically calls "our own beloved country."

Before speaking about "shameless" displays of "grovelling selfishness," Mr. Brooks should look up some not quite ancient speeches of my Lords Salisbury, Hartington, and Churchill; also speeches of Messrs. Goschen and Chamberlain. The chief difference between Mr. Blaine and these unworthy Englishmen—I cannot forbear the qualification, to omit it were by implication to justify every American sneer—is that, whilst Mr. Blaine abides by valour, my lords and gentlemen abide by discretion, which, no doubt, they regard as the better part of valour. Mr. Blaine assaults the strong, the rich, the armed; Salisbury and allies outrage the weak, the poor, the disarmed. The sneering American would say that the distinction was, "English, quite English, you know." Emphatically, no; cowardice is not English. In this, as in other matters, England is most scandalously—nay, dishonourably—misrepresented.

Mr. Brooks deals incidentally and jejunely—and apparently under compulsion, which he, as a loyal man, could not wholly evade—with the article in the *London Standard*, in which that paper magniloquently writes about bombarding New York and laying Boston in ashes. But he deals in quite a different fashion, and by no means jejunely, with American counter war-blasts against England. These, it would seem, are altogether too infamous. Now, what are the dry facts of the case? The *London Standard*, usually sedate enough, is notoriously the organ of the present Conservative Ministry; the offending article was supposed to be, and probably was, inspired—the hand is that of Esau: there is nothing in Lord Salisbury's antecedents to render such an assumption unwarrantable. Sturdy Americans resented the brutal threats of the *London Standard*, and retorted in kind. From the standpoint of English susceptibilities this was regrettable; from the standpoint of American susceptibilities it was very natural.

No doubt Mr. Whitney, United States Secretary of the Navy, offended against diplomatic reserve when he declared that the "United States could whip England." Lord Salisbury, of course, never offends

against diplomatic reserve—his tongue never runs away from discretion. As to Mr. Whitney's additional statement that the United States have navy enough to destroy England's shipping, ingenuity enough to defend the United States' seaboard, and men enough to capture Canada—well, it certainly is strong enough, and possibly true enough, to make English Jingoese turn purple in the face. The moral for moderate men to draw from such incidents is to see that the Jingoese do not make the running; assuredly, should the pinch of war come, it is not the Jingoese, but the sedate manhood of Great Britain, that will have to do the long fighting. Let those who deprecate unnatural war assist in strangling Jingoism at home. Patriotic hysterics do not brace the nerves, nor arm a nation.

Here let me refer to a matter of growing importance. Extraordinary as it may appear to Englishmen by the home fireside, war between Great Britain and the United States is well within range of the possible. It is quite true that here, in the United States, men and women, boys and girls in their teens, and "even Christian ministers, contemplate without regret, and some of them apparently with satisfaction, the prospect of a war between the two countries." I have myself witnessed the eyes of gentle women positively scintillate whilst discussing the subject. Nor can any fair-minded man regard the Irish Americans as responsible, to any appreciable degree, for this condition of affairs. Quite the contrary: I am disposed to regard the Irish-Americans as a restraining element rather than otherwise. The same applies to the German-Americans. My reasons for so holding cannot be detailed here: those of a scientific bent of mind may, however, infer some of them from what I have yet to say upon the subject. England's sternest, coldest, most critical censors I have ever found among descendants of the old settlers; surely these retain something of ancient Puritan bitterness. The source of estrangement I am inclined to trace largely to the fact that the average American reads no history but United States history; and that he can scarcely be said to study. The average American is too busy and, I fear, too indifferent a man to care much for anything outside of his counting-house or profession; he is so engrossingly engaged in making history, in building up the material resources of a mighty republic, that of history as history he practically knows less than nothing at all. It follows, without saying, that a people whose historical reading is thus limited, and living in an everlasting *now*, practically loses the whole philosophy of history; the roots of which, indeed, trace back to a period anterior to the discovery of the American continent itself. The American (the average American) notes facts he is incapable of appreciating: he bolts, but he does not taste. For him historical facts are often more misleading than figures prove to non-statisticians: which is saying a good deal.

Figures are usually dry, and their study necessarily excites, in some degree, the critical faculty; how far history may degenerate into a mere emotional exercise I will not undertake to determine. Let a hall full of yelling "British" Jingoës supply the response. Without being in any sense a "British Jingo," the average American is patriotic, and impressionable, and a trifle intense. I have already used the term noonday impressions: I shall then be understood when I say that popular American history consists of noonday impressions. Let me illustrate.

Of course Americans regard "Independence" as their great achievement. In this they are quite right. When, however, they proceed to regard Independence as a victory gained over England, their enemy, they are surely egregiously in error. England never was the enemy of a people "justly fighting to be free." At the time the United States were fighting for Independence, England was fighting for her liberties: the common enemy was the Hanoverian George III. and his Germanized Court. England did not exactly want a change of dynasty and another revolution at home—old settled communities very properly avoid as long as possible pushing political controversy to that extreme; but assuredly England did not, at any time, begrudge the colonists what they strove after. When the news was brought to London that the United States had appealed to arms, William Pitt, an Englishman if ever there was one, rose in his seat in Parliament, and, with uplifted voice, thanked God that the American colonists retained enough of English blood to fight for their rights. Nine Englishmen out of every ten, outside of Court influence, similarly rejoiced. Independence Day is as much a red-letter day for every genuine Englishman as for every genuine American. And so it should be: Washington but trod in the footsteps of Hampden; his task was easier than that of Hampden's, and the solution he wrote—which an interval of three thousand miles of ocean practically dictated—was more thorough.

Certain prejudices, based largely upon misconceptions on both sides, have grown up between England and the United States. Of these prejudices, I will only say—let time, and patience, and better information do their work. Unfortunately, there are in every country men who are unwilling to let national prejudices expire, and who use them to further objects of personal aggrandisement. Let us not become unconscious tools of such men, of whom, candour must say, there are ten in aristocratic England to one in the United States. Meanwhile, there are some compensating considerations; to paraphrase an old aphorism—When Jingoës fall out, honest men may come by their own.

On the whole, the average American is not ignobly jealous of the parent country, not unscrupulously captious, not knowingly unjust; he is simply historically, and critically, uninformed. In United

States history, England figures practically as sole protagonist: the United States acquired her independence in England's despite; England's finger was in Napoleon's Mexican adventure; England, the great emancipator, which has done more to put down slavery than the rest of the world combined, forsooth favoured the cause of the slave-holding South; England is most concerned in opposing the Monroe doctrine—*i.e.*, an extension of self-government; England robbed the United States of her mercantile marine; and to-day, if not exactly intriguing at Panama and Lomoa, England is certainly trying to cajole the United States out of her infant manufactures. All arguments to the contrary are met with incredulous smiles, and by references to history that would be funny were they not saddening. As things stand, anything in the nature of an appeal to our common language and mission is entirely out of place. There are too many blatant tongues at home, denouncing every allusion to humanity and the heart as "sickly sentimentality," to admit of such appeals being successful, or, indeed, dignified. We reap as Jingoese sow.

As to the "mission of the English-speaking races," Americans are irreverent enough to believe that America and Australia are quite capable of running it, even if the pragmatic little island off the coast of Europe were to disappear from the face of the globe altogether—an opinion in which I utterly fail to agree. After all, there is such a thing as historical continuity. England, upon whose dominions the sun never sets, is, perhaps, alone among nations, capable of welding this world of ours into a glorified whole, in which East and West, the past, present, and future, shall be harmoniously and artistically blended. The democracies of America and of Australia have probably energy enough to create a new type of civilization peculiarly their own, but they could not hope to impose it upon the more ancient and critical nations of Europe and of Asia, even if the Monroe doctrine did not intervene to forbid the attempt. With the disappearance of England, which encircles what she compresses, the link that binds would part; the world would be divided into two great camps, and the course of human progress would be thrown back several centuries. Whatever the final outcome, much would inevitably be lost that is well worth preserving—precious essences, distilled in the alembic of time, and ripened by five thousand years of accumulated experience under every clime.

However, war has not yet been declared between Great Britain and the United States. Meanwhile, if England—of which it may be said she is the perverse heart of Great Britain; Scotland, Ireland, and Wales being frankly sympathetic towards democracy, though not more genuinely sound at bottom than England, old watch-dog of liberty—meanwhile, if England requires friendship of the United States, she can have it, in full measure, pressed down, and overflowing. But there is only one way of obtaining it: the way of good deeds.

England must be her genuine self. She must indulge less in the sour, morose, suspicious way of the valetudinarian ; be less wayward, and less froward.

Having long grieved, and, like Mr. Brooks, even indignantly grieved, over the apparent harshness of the United States, I now, better advised, and with enlarged sympathies, frankly rejoice over it. The fact is, the United States has a great and essential mission of her own to fulfil on earth. Consciously or unconsciously, she is fulfilling that mission. When leagued tyrants overshadowed Europe, and the outlook was black for liberty, an English statesman stood forward and proclaimed that the New World was called in to redress the balance of the Old. I always regarded this sentiment as oratorically fine ; I now accept it reverently as part of the faith of humanity. The mission of the United States is to be as a shield for peoples : she is also a sword held in reserve by the once-oppressed—refugees from all countries—that is to put down mighty oppressors from their seats, and to exalt the industrious, lowly, and meek.

The United States is run by the masses in the interests of the masses : and no country ruled in despite of the masses, and by the classes, can ever be safe of her friendship. The sword of the democratic Damocles is ever hung over the councils of sovereigns and statesmen, suspended by a hair. Yesterday it fell upon the dynasty of Napoleon III. (the decline of which dates from the Mexican fiasco) ; to-day it threatens the scheming head of Salisbury ; to-morrow, perchance, it may determine the fate of Bismarck and of the German Empire.

This utter disregard of nations as nations by the United States is really singular, considering how much of her independence she owes to France, how much of her institutions to England, and how many of her best citizens to Germany. Yet the explanation is simple. The United States cannot afford to have hereditary friendships or hereditary enmities. In the best sense of the term her sympathies are cosmopolitan : the friends of democracy are her friends, and the enemies of democracy are her enemies—the dynastic and class intrigues of sovereigns and of statesmen she simply ignores. Surely there is Providence working in this !

The anomalous race positions in the United States, instead of being a source of external embarrassment, impart extreme celerity to her gravest decisions, and add marvellously to her fighting mobility. In a general way, ten million Irish-Americans are neutralized by ten million German-Americans. This is a source of internal security. It does not, however, by any means follow that these elements may be disregarded abroad. Under certain conditions, as I have already hinted, these racial rivalries render the relations of the United States with foreign powers—more particularly with Great Britain, also with Germany—peculiarly sensitive, and, at the same time, par-

ticularly strong, at what it has become the custom to call the psychological moment.

Irish-Americans and German-Americans vie as to which shall be most American—that is, most for the *people*. These rivalries place marching orders with the Americans proper, who make good their position by holding high above clashing nationalities the “Banner of the People.” Thus, let Irish-Americans once satisfy native Americans that the cause of Home Rule involved the fate of a “People,” and let native Americans but hold up a finger in approval, and with a swing, as one man, the German-Americans would become, so far as England was concerned, more Irish than the Irish-Americans. The emulation of twenty million aroused everything would be bound to go in: then would leap forth the cataract. In the long run no country in the world could stand against the United States fighting in a cause that enlisted the sympathies of the whole community, for the simple reason that there is no such other democracy in existence. Well-ordered and contented democracies—no matter what supporters of the monarchical idea may say to the contrary—are fearful engines of war; as Charles the Bold and the proud Hapsburgs found to their cost when they hurled their chivalry (mostly hirelings) against the free Switzers—few in number, mighty in resolution. Americans are not few in number, and, as the Civil War proved, they are resolute.

Need I add that in debate of peace or war no question of money would stand in the way of the United States—her treasury is overflowing. American “Protectionists” might even come to regard the addition of a few hundred millions to the United States National Debt as a happy release from an embarrassing economic position, and as assuring to their views a fresh lease of power.

A word as to the Sackville incident, to the bottom of which Mr. Brooks admits he “never was able to get”; but over which, nevertheless, he succeeds in growing exceedingly warm.

Lord Sackville fell into a trap, which every man of honour must admit no gentleman should have set for him. His letter, though colourless and unobjectionable in itself, was ill-timed. Technically, Lord Sackville was in error. Under all the circumstances of the case he would have best consulted his own dignity and the interests of his country, if, upon his actions becoming a subject of partisan controversy, he had tendered his resignation: failing which, the British Government should have summarily recalled him: failing which, President Cleveland did quite right to dismiss him.

The doctrine that Ambassadors and Cabinet Ministers—men in high positions upon fat salaries—are too sacred to be touched, that their comfort are of more account than the destinies of nations and the liberties of peoples—is one I feel considerable reserve in accept-

ing; or rather, no reserve at all in rejecting. I really do think that the question of Tariff Reform in the United States was of more importance than Lord Sackville's dignity; just as I think that in waging war against her Majesty's subjects of Ireland the present British Cabinet have offended immeasurably beyond the value of their own not particularly useful lives. The fact of drawing £5000 a year from the national exchequer should not place a man practically beyond criticism, or the effectual reach of law. Waiving, however, all discussion of "thorough," the least to be expected is that, at this time of day, English Radicals should not in their Liberalism fall far below the standard of the Whig Macaulay.

The idea of non-responsibility in high places is utterly unworthy of a race of freemen.

Having done his best to place Lord Sackville upon a plane of non-responsibility, and above that of ordinary men, Mr. Brooks, quite consistently enough, proceeds to blame President Cleveland for not putting himself above the Constitution of the United States. That is to say, President Cleveland having taken one view of the Fisheries Question and the United States Senate—the proper body to deal authoritatively with such subjects—having taken another, Mr. Brooks thinks President Cleveland should have pursued his own way. Instead of doing so, President Cleveland, loyally accepting the decision of the Senate, and acting up not merely to the letter but to the spirit of that decision, sent a message to Congress demanding power to retaliate upon Canada. This act of loyal deference—for which, by the way, a message from President Grant in 1870, and dealing with the same Fisheries Question, offers some precedent—Mr. Brooks calls turning a "somersault."

If Mr. Brooks wants to study the subject of "somersaults," he had better turn his attention to the doings of England's "Premier," and of the "Unionist" gymnasts. There was a time, not remote, when Lord Salisbury more than coquetted with Home Rule, and denounced Coercion as illogical; insinuated compliments of the "Irish chieftain;" counted heads with Parnellites for the overthrow of Mr. Gladstone's Ministry, for which purpose he herded indifferently, into the same pen, Tory sheep and Parnellite goats, thereby succeeding to the Premiership for the first time; arranged with Parnellites for a General Election, and accepted Parnellite votes in every constituency throughout the country; sent his Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, Lord Carnarvon, to hold secret council with Parnell in secret places; and now, lo! we have the Parnell Commission foraging into speeches delivered and into events that occurred before this great consolidation of Tory-Parnellite interests, and with Lord Salisbury's name omitted from the list of the impeached. Then, as to the Liberal Unionists: What a flood of light is let in upon their proceedings by Mr. Goschen's sickening

cant about Coercion meaning "Emancipation." It was not upon any such gloss that the Devonshire House coterie secured reelection. For political harlequinading, somersaults, and brave lying, where can the grand combination troupe of the *Marqueesses* be paralleled?

After lashing himself into a fine fury over the naughtiness of the United States, Mr. Brooks, in a somewhat enigmatical passage—indeed, I would not regard it as otherwise—goes on to say that under certain circumstances "we"—and by "we" he elaborately explains that he intends "a friend of Ireland, and a Radical, and a Home Ruler of the most pronounced type," to wit, Mr. Brooks himself—"we shall have to reconsider our position." Anglophobia exists in the United States. Irish-Americans are numerous in the United States. Therefore, Ireland must be punished. For shame, Mr. Brooks! The spirit dictating such threats is vixenish, not to say wholly unworthy. The policy of coercing A by threatening vengeance against B smacks too much of the principles of the bandit, who, having captured a prisoner, writes to the prisoner's father, "Send me a thousand pounds by messenger, or I will forward your son's ears by next post."

• As regards Home Rule, which evidently was uppermost in Mr. Brooks's mind when he wrote on "*Anglophobia in the United States*," I should have thought that the time for "reconsidering" had long passed. But the curse of grave times is the man who is ever "reconsidering," and who is ever turning up in wrong places. Falkland was always *reconsidering*, and passed his time in walking between Whitehall and Westminster, and walking back again. Such men, though of no account for good, do infinite mischief. They arouse hopes they are too weak to fulfil; they are the rotten reeds upon which tyrants lean, but which wiser men learn early to fling aside as worthless. Marston Moor was not won until the kindly, weakly, reconsidering generation had quit the Parliamentary camp for good, leaving Cromwell alone with his Ironsiders behind him and a good square issue in front.

I must bring these remarks to a close. I do so by joining issue with Mr. Brooks all along the line.

Mr. Brooks speaks of Anglophobia in the United States. I reply that Anglophobia in the United States is as nothing to Anglophobia in England. It is less malignant, less immediate, less real, and altogether less dangerous.

What is Anglophobia? To say that it is hatred of England assists us little in our inquiry. England is a geographical expression, and geographical expressions do not usually excite hatred in rational beings. Anglophobia is not hatred of a latitude and longitude, but



hatred of historic England : hatred of English institutions, of English customs, of English habits of thought, above all of English liberty—to which England practically owes everything typically English. No man whose lips can form the one word *liberty* can be an Anglo-phobist, and remain sane. It is the shibboleth whereby the true England can unhesitatingly separate her friends from her enemies. Where liberty is there England's interests are also : where liberty is not there England's interests (save they be missionary of liberty) are not, and cannot therefore be threatened. Anglophobia, at its worst, is high treason against liberty upon England's own soil. This granted, as it must be, the rest follows.

There is no need for beating about the bush in this matter. History furnishes us with authoritative examples of what Anglo-phobia is. Most solemnly was the cause heard, most solemnly was the decision given : and the records remain for the enlightenment of the world and for the instruction of Englishmen to the end of time. At the head of Anglophobists stand the traitor King, Charles ; the traitor Minister, Strafford ; the traitor Priest, Laud : wretches who resorted, at every turn, to the meannesses of lying, to the pettinesses of chicanery, and to the villanies of fraud, in order to accomplish their unhallowed ends—the enslavement of a free, upright, and generous people. These Anglophobists—whose acceptance of French gold, and traitorous intrigues with the Bourbons, and panderings to Rome may be passed over as insignificant details, buried out of sight and lost, in moral bogs of slimy turpitude that are simply bottomless—paid the penalty of their execrable crimes. Long may England remain sufficiently *English* to exact such penalty against State traitors. Though the Stuart dynasty is dead, it would seem there are still among us resurrectionists of the politically putrescent. Be it so. Under management of the skilled husbandman rotteness itself may become a forcing ground for things healthful and useful.

Under existing circumstances the less discussions about Anglo-phobia in the United States, and elsewhere, the better. Let Englishmen attend to the work in hand, and to that alone : the spirit of lying, chicanery, and fraud, that so fearfully possessed the arch-traitors of the seventeenth century, is once more moving in our midst—nay, grasping the very helm of affairs. Assuredly there is no need for alarm, but most assuredly there are precious reasons why every Englishman, worthy of the name, should just now acquit himself as a soldier on duty—unboasting, undistracted, silent, alert, resolute.

O. J. CASEY.

## HOME AFFAIRS.

It is necessary to write on the eve of the opening of Parliament. Happily, there is no reason to anticipate any immediate Ministerial revelations of great importance, and in a general way the programme of the session is already matter of common knowledge. Ministers meet Parliament without any change. Mr. Smith remains, at any rate for a space longer, the "leader" of the House of Commons. The little plot for removing him has miscarried. The right hon. gentleman is the indispensable man in the House of Commons, and whatever his shortcomings in regard to the management of public business, these must be swallowed lest other and more serious difficulties are created. There is no longer any talk of a reform of the Rules of Procedure. Already it is seen that the "quiet session" of which we have heard so much is likely to be marked by much storm and tumult. The prudent commander, therefore, does not propose to add to his cargo. National defence is to be the great matter of the session, and, next to this, a Local Government Bill for Scotland. As to the former, we ought to have a surprise if the indications may be safely read. Ministers have never spoken lately without making ominous reference to the condition of affairs on the Continent, and preaching the duty of putting our defences in order. Mr. Goschen says he intends to sacrifice his Budget to this end, and the unofficial Tories variously pledge the Government to an expenditure running from five to forty millions sterling. For ourselves, we think the first figure the more probable. The wise thing in this matter is that expenditure should be regular and sufficient, not intermittent and excessive. If Ministers have other views, and make any panic-producing proposals, such as have more recently been reported, it will be the duty of the Opposition, even at the risk of misconstruction, to give them check, and to point to the better way.

There has naturally been much discussion during the month of this question of national defence. But it has to a large extent been discussion in the dark. We are without any knowledge of the evidence given to the Committee of the Cabinet as to the adequacy of our forces, and are equally uninformed as to the conclusions, if any, which Lord Hartington's Commission have arrived at concerning the administration of the services. It is useless to examine the wild rumours

which had their origin in Manchester. At the same time, some persons seem to fancy that we are about to witness a demand for the fortification of London on the continental pattern—by a ring of first-class forts of masonry and iron—as well as other large expenditure upon coast and harbour defence, and of course upon the Navy. General Sir Andrew Clarke has thought it his duty to protest in advance against the idea of fortifying the capital, and has urged with force that field-works sufficient for every purpose could be prepared in the space of three weeks. Sir Lintorn Simmons, discussing the whole question of the organization of the services for the defence of the country, launches the notion of a separate Ministry of Defence, supported by a council of experts, including both the Secretary for War and the First Lord of the Admiralty. This proposal has been warmly attacked from various quarters as destroying the responsibility of the departments, and we mention it merely as exhibiting the sort of project which commends itself to a capable military authority. More important than all has been the barefaced recommendation of universal military service by Lord Wolseley at Birmingham. The Adjutant-General did not, it is true, put forward the conscription as the one thing needful for the salvation of the country, but he commended the service as a means of physical training and in the interests of the preservation of the best qualities of the race.

The noble lord was at the time the guest of Mr. Chamberlain, who was with him on the platform. Mr. Chamberlain had spoken earlier on, and had committed himself to a considerable addition to our naval strength, and when the two appeared together at a Volunteer prize distribution next day, he took the opportunity of repudiating any sympathy with Lord Wolseley's views on the conscription. The right hon. gentleman thought we were hardly prepared for this, and that the physical training which Lord Wolseley thought so necessary might be obtained in connection with the Volunteer movement. Then Mr. Chamberlain declared himself strongly in favour of making the Volunteers a mobile force, which could independently keep the field, and thought that the Government should venture upon this scheme whatever sacrifices it might entail. Lord Wolseley said significantly, that when Mr. Chamberlain became Minister of War he should not fail to remind him of this incident. 'It must be said that the member for West Birmingham is qualifying apace for the direction of one of the fighting services. If he could be substituted either for Lord George Hamilton or Mr. Stanhope it would be a decided gain for the Government. His old colleagues do not, however, find it convenient to throw to the winds the professions of a lifetime. At Newcastle Mr. Morley denounced Lord Wolseley's suggestion of the conscription in the words, "I never heard greater nonsense or worse morality." Previously, at Sheffield, he had recalled Cobden's saying that he would spend 100 millions a year, if it were

necessary, to keep the supremacy of the seas. The Liberal leaders were, he said, as anxious for a strong Navy as the Government themselves, but they would take care that the proposals of Ministers upon all these questions of defence should be properly probed, and that the expenditure should be justified by the Minister who suggested it to Parliament and the country. This attitude of reserve, which is surely the proper thing for a leading member of the Opposition, has been severely criticized by the Government organs, and it is said that the Liberal leaders mean to act the unpatriotic part of throwing obstacles in the way of measures vital to the safety of the country. This is of course a mere begging of the whole question. If the Government plans are proved to be vital to our security, they will have the hearty approval of Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues, but the proof must be clearly established. Less than this, and the Opposition would be guilty of a grave breach of duty in being complaisant to Ministers.

The purely political controversy has been energetically conducted since we last wrote. It has turned in the main upon recent events in Ireland. Mr. William O'Brien's escape from the court-house at Carrick-on-Suir, his disappearance for several days, and his sudden resurgence in Mr. Jacob Bright's meeting at Manchester, when the place was surrounded by detectives and police expecting his coming and ready to make his arrest, have cast much ridicule upon the Irish Executive. We may say here that the flight seems to have been quite unpremeditated. Mr. O'Brien surrendered himself at Carrick, and expected a sentence such as would have given him the right of appeal. He would accordingly have been free to keep an engagement made in advance to attend the meeting at Manchester in the week following. Unexpected events at Carrick—the conduct of the police, who assaulted both the defendant and his counsel as they sought to enter the court, the offensive refusal to admit the public to the hearing of the case, and the autocratic bearing of the magistrates in relation to the handful of people who gained access to the gallery of the building—induced Mr. Healy's sudden impulse to throw up his brief, and Mr. O'Brien, with equal suddenness, determined to follow his counsel. That the latter got away is an amazing thing. The police, in a fury of disappointment and vexation, made the most strenuous efforts to seize him, yet he was able to drive a distance of ninety miles through the open country to the coast at Wexford, there to find security on board a coasting vessel which only sailed some hours later for a port in the Bristol Channel. At Manchester a *ruse* equally cheated the local police, and Mr. O'Brien was able to tell the electors of the next constituency to that for which Mr. Balfour himself sits, how the "outlaw," who is habitually accused of coercing the Irish people to all manner of things which offend them, was able "day after day to

traverse immense districts of four counties, my movements known, and my face familiar to thousands and tens of thousands of people—through a country swarming with police and military, who could not purchase the secret which was the common gossip around thousands of Irish firesides.” And the orator went on to say that he thought it might be useful for once to give this demonstration of “the idiotic nonsense and arrant fudge which is talked by those who say that we are intimidating a people who would shed their hearts’ blood to serve us.” Probably nothing could have had more weight with the people of Manchester than this remarkable object lesson. Mr. O’Brien’s speech was indeed a masterpiece in its perfect appositeness and strength, whilst it flamed and flashed with the intense vigour of the speaker, who literally carried all before him. A word from Mr. O’Brien, and it is highly probable that the massed battalions of the Manchester police would not have sufficed to apprehend him. But he desired that the object lesson should be completed by his arrest in the heart of an English city, where he was an honoured guest. It was accordingly quietly arranged that he should surrender at the close of the meeting, and the great Irishman, having been nearly killed by the too friendly demonstrations of those who wished to shake him by the hand, was marched through the crowded streets of the commercial capital of Lancashire, amid a scene which baffles all description, to the Town Hall. The Mayor, partaking of the popular sympathy, lodged him in the state apartments for the night, and entertained him to breakfast next morning before he set out for Ireland in the charge of his captors.

Acting in his absence, the magistrates at Carrick-on-Suir had sentenced Mr. O’Brien to four months’ imprisonment without hard labour. The result was that he was taken direct to Clonmel, and lodged in gaol. Then the public conscience was revolted beyond measure by the news that the man, who had been a popular hero in a Lancashire city but a few hours earlier, had been forcibly stripped of his clothes, and, whilst partly unconscious, put into the prison livery, “cropped,” and “clipped.” Mr. O’Brien fought with four warders as long as he could, and when he recovered he found not only that he was in the prison uniform, but that his whiskers and beard had been shorn as well as his hair. Friendly magistrates going to the gaol reported these circumstances, and it appeared in the public Press that Mr. O’Brien, having thrown off the prison clothes, was in his cell with no other covering than his shirt, and in a great state of mental excitement and prostration. Naturally, this statement roused very bitter feelings. In Clonmel and some other towns, the traders put up their shutters as a sign of protest, and matters got to such a crisis, as time passed without any change coming to Mr. O’Brien, that the Lord Mayor of Dublin felt it incumbent upon him to send to the Chief Secretary calling for his intervention in behalf of Mr. O’Brien. There was no reply

to the first telegraphic appeal, and the Lord Mayor's messenger, going to the Chief Secretary's Lodge at two o'clock in the morning, was assailed by Mr. Hayes Fisher, M.P. (Mr. Balfour's secretary), with abusive language, in which the words "You are an impudent rascal" certainly formed part. The next night Mr. Balfour appeared at a Unionist banquet in Dublin, and gave immense delight to his entertainers by sneering at Mr. O'Brien, and saying of him that he had thrown every obstacle in the way of the medical examination, so that he (Mr. Balfour) had thought it right to send to Clonmel the medical reports made concerning Mr. O'Brien when he was in Tullamore Gaol. The Chief Secretary has since acknowledged that he blundered when he said that Mr. O'Brien resisted the doctor; all the prisoner did was to decline to answer questions about his health, having in mind the previous suggestion of the Chief Secretary that he took advantage of his condition to escape the pressure of the regulations. But, having jeered at his prisoner at the banquet, Mr. Balfour was very shortly afterwards compelled to satisfy public feeling. The Catholic hierarchy launched a grave protest against the treatment of the prisoner as calculated to imperil his health and the public peace, and, a medical member of the Prisons Board having been despatched to Clonmel, Mr. O'Brien was promptly removed to the infirmary, having first received his own clothes and his spectacles, which last had also been taken from him. His friends, coming to see him, were surprised to find him reading before a comfortable fire, and in much better physical condition. He has gained his point, whatever we may think of it—that he is entitled to the treatment we accord to a political prisoner, and to escape that of the common criminal. The Minister who believes in twenty years of resolute government as the one thing needful for Ireland, has again surrendered before the indignant outcry of the country. This does not, of course, prevent him saying daily that the public agitation to which he has succumbed is a hollow farce, thus indirectly condemning his own action.

As a matter of fact, it is very far from a farce. There have been numerous purely party demonstrations no doubt, but there have also been large open public meetings where the friends of the Government have had full play, and these have as regularly pronounced against the treatment of Mr. O'Brien. Take the meeting held in Paradise Square, Sheffield, where Mr. Howard Vincent's amendment expressing confidence in Ministers was handsomely defeated, with the result that Mr. Vincent coolly telegraphed to Lord Salisbury that thousands of Sheffield men had declared for the Government, and Lord Salisbury effusively wired back his thanks for what was in effect a slap in the face. But more than this; the attack on the person of Mr. O'Brien has started a serious "National Protest" against coercion, which is obtaining widespread support from the educated and leisured classes. The public conscience has been stirred to a depth not hituerto

reached, and the Tories are not a little concerned at it. If we could have the private correspondence of certain members of the Government during the last month, we venture to say the protests of their political friends would form no small portion of it.

A shocking crime in Donegal has been put forward by the alarmed Ministerialists, among whom we may reckon Mr. Chamberlain, to check the flow of the public indignation in regard to Mr. O'Brien. There is no need to confuse the two things, and the trick does not succeed. The murder of Inspector Martin is a piece of cruel savagery, utterly disgraceful to our humanity. And it is the more deplorable that it might, and should, have been prevented. The incurable stupidity of our executive officers in Ireland must shortly become a standing reproach. Father McFadden, the well-known patriotic priest of Gweedore, had been "wanted" for more than a week. He could have been taken at any hour of the day or night during that period, and especially could he have been taken on the Sunday morning as he went to say early mass at his church. But the police actually waited until the end of the mid-day service, when the village was crowded by the parishioners of the reverend gentleman, to make the seizure. And worse still—when there were over two hundred men within call—the commanding officer sent just half a dozen to perform a duty which should have been the work of them all. The half-dozen were savagely attacked, and the chief of the small band—Inspector Martin, whose own conduct does not seem to have been over-discreet—was felled to the ground and cruelly beaten about the head until he was nearly dead. Father McFadden had been seized, but in the confusion he had got away and entered his house, from an upper window of which he made repeated efforts to induce the people to disperse. And when he heard of what had happened, he surrendered, and placed his house at the disposal of the doctors for the treatment of the dying officer. At the time of writing, the Crown have made him an accomplice in the murder, and, waiving their first charge against him, intend to put him on his trial, with nearly a dozen other persons, for causing the death of Mr. Martin. We must wait for a disclosure of the evidence to understand upon what grounds the authorities have taken action, but, so far as we can see, the reverend gentleman is in no danger. It is, indeed, something like an affront to put him in the position of a murderer. But the ways of Dublin Castle are past all finding out, and we can only suggest that it has been forgotten that murder is not triable under the Crimes Act, but before a jury.

Upon such matters as the foregoing, party controversy has been keen, and even exciting. Mr. Morley has stigmatized the treatment of Mr. O'Brien as "brutal and senseless," and reproved his audience at Newcastle for the levity with which they appeared to regard the murder of Inspector Martin. The Tories and their allies have, of

course, nothing but praise for our "resolute" Chief Secretary, and Sir Wilfrid Lawson "thanks God for Mr. Balfour" in quite another sense. Mr. Courtney, with some criticisms on particular points of policy, sees on the whole a "great system of justice and equality" working in Ireland. Mr. Chamberlain has nothing but sarcasms for Mr. O'Brien. Yet the Chief Secretary himself, in the Dublin speech which gave such just offence, admitted most completely the enormous influence wielded in Ireland by the Irish party. He talked, indeed of the progress which the Executive were making in the restoration of public order and tranquillity, and Mr. Chamberlain has since referred to this language with great self-satisfaction. But we ask for proofs. Ireland is no doubt sharing in the improvement of prices, and in the general, if slow, increase of trade. It is fortunate for Mr. Balfour that these things come at this particular period. At the same time we cannot allow that he is the creator of them, or that they have in any sort anything to do with his policy in Ireland.

Can any reasonable man say that we are any nearer—save by the inevitable lapse of time—the solution of the Irish question? The popular leaders in Ireland are still going cheerfully to prison. Mr. Shuehy, Mr. Kilbride, Mr. Carew, have all in turn, like Mr. O'Brien, been arrested in Great Britain, where they were engaged in political work, and deported beyond St. George's Channel. Englishmen and Scotchmen alike have found the policy of coercion brought very clearly before their eyes, and, if we may judge by the indications they have given, they have found it very repulsive at close quarters. Mr. O'Brien himself has been taken from Clonmel to Tralee, from Tralee to Killarney, and thence back to Tralee to undergo trial for his work in introducing the Plan of Campaign on the estate of the Earl of Kenmare. Mr. Cecil Roche, whom the editor of *United Ireland* has severely criticized again and again, sat in judgment upon the hon. member, and, after a deplorable scene, in which Mr. T. Healy, M.P., as counsel for Mr. O'Brien, again played a prominent part, a sentence of six months' imprisonment was passed. Previously, a perfectly safe offer was made on the part of the Crown not to press for punishment if Mr. O'Brien would promise to abstain from further advocacy of the Plan of Campaign. Mr. O'Brien took it as an insult, and Mr. Roche did not mend matters by saying that he would have given the prisoner hard labour if his health had not been weak. The sentence is to run concurrently, so far as it will, with that which Mr. O'Brien is now undergoing as the result of the trial at Carrick-on-Suir, ~~while~~ a third prosecution hanging over his head has been abandoned. It need hardly be added here that an appeal to the Court of Exchequer against the sentence passed at Carrick in the absence of the defendant failed, as a previous application made, on different grounds, in the interests of Mr. Edward Harrington, M.P., now in prison at Tralee, had failed. And the Irish Queen's Bench



have finally quashed the verdict of the coroner's jury, which launched a charge of homicide against the leaders of the evicting party at Ardee for the death of an old man named Dunne.

Thus does Ireland continue to be the sport of parties. We cannot but mourn over the fact that Ministers and their allies learn nothing from experience. Of serious practical proposals for Ireland they have none. True, they offer us drainage works when we want an Arrears Bill. Everything must wait until they can arrange matters with their friends—the Irish landlords. To do Mr. Chamberlain justice, he sees the danger of this. In his recent Scotch tour, he told the Glasgow Unionists they were leading a forlorn hope if they had no positive policy. He seems to be anxious to pass a great measure of land purchase for Ireland, and after saying many offensive things of Mr. Gladstone, as is his wont, he again asks the Gladstonians to join hands with the Unionists in this matter. He holds to his view, that to deal with the agrarian question is to destroy the demand for an Irish Legislature. There never was a greater mistake, as Mr. Chamberlain himself admitted not many years ago. On the more pressing arrears question he is dumb; but he declares that the Round Table Conference produced almost complete agreement upon land purchase, and he challenges the publication of the proceedings of the Conference. The challenge has been promptly accepted, though the tactics of the right hon. gentleman are not free from suspicion. If the Liberal leaders will admit they were at one with him on this question, and the Government will obligingly take up the scheme which Mr. Chamberlain has certainly pressed upon them, a Purchase Bill could not, he calculates, be seriously opposed. As a matter of fact, however, the Liberal leaders have always held that the reform of local government in Ireland, with the creation of county boards, was a condition precedent to an effective treatment of land purchase.

For Great Britain Mr. Chamberlain has equally his own policy:—Free education for the masses, and the application of the principle of the Ashbourne Act, with a first advance of five millions sterling, in the interests of the farmers. To his pets—the Scotch crofters and cottiers of the Highlands and Western Isles—he would give further facilities so as to allow them to increase the size of their holdings and to encourage them to migrate, or, if they choose, to emigrate. We do not grudge anything to the crofters, but one may well ask why Mr. Chamberlain, who is so generous in this quarter, refuses to give the Irish tenant the benefit of the arrears clauses of the Crofters' Act. It will be interesting to hear the Duke of Argyll upon these new proposals for the crofters. The suggested extension of the Ashbourne Act to Great Britain has already given his Grace much anxiety. Finally, Mr. Chamberlain told his Scotch friends that he was willing to give them full control over their own Private

Bill legislation, and that, whilst he was against Scotch Home Rule and the principle of nationality which lay at the root of it, he would be glad to see the country in the possession of two or three great provincial councils with the right of initiating legislation, which (in case of practical unanimity) should be endorsed by the Imperial Parliament without any sort of amendment. Criticism upon a policy of this sort is a mere waste of time. And for this reason, if for no other—that Mr. Chamberlain, whilst putting forth his schemes, says he is prepared “to sink or swim with the Union.” But one would like to see Mr. Chamberlain settle upon some plan of larger local government, and stick to it. We do not accuse him of insincerity, but of not knowing his own mind. Yet he has the hardihood to talk of the Limehouse programme as “so much political birdlime,” which is his way of saying that Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Morley are charlatans. A man who will tell the world at large of the benefits he has conferred upon his friends—*vide* the Birmingham reference to Mr. Morley’s “obligations”—is, however, not likely to be guilty of reasonable discussion.

The county councils are already busy on a mass of preliminary work which must be done before they enter upon possession of their plenary powers on the 1st of April. When last we wrote, the elections were only partly completed. Politics entered more largely into the contests than we foresaw. In Wales, for instance, the councils have, with one exception, each a very large Liberal majority; and in Breconshire, Liberals and Tories are about equal. This is in part the result of Mr. Morley’s advice at Newport that Welsh Home Rule should come through the county councils. Mr. Morley, Sir George Trevelyan, and, with more hesitation, Mr. Gladstone, have all agreed that politics can hardly be excluded from these elections. At Sheffield, Mr. Morley rejoiced greatly over the success of the Reformers in London. Things have since been going less comfortably than one would wish in London. The contest as to the appointment of aldermen, which set the *Pall Mall Gazette* and the *Star* at serious loggerheads, resulted in the election of persons outside the Council, and, with one exception, these were all favourable to the policy of the so-called Progressives. This election has been roundly denounced as a piece of “jerrymandering,” and no doubt it has given offence as well to the Tories as to the *Pall Mall Gazette*. A more generous line might have been taken without any loss of power to the majority, already sufficiently strong to do anything upon which they could agree. As to the principle of choosing aldermen from the outside, instead of from within the Council itself, a good deal may be said for and against. The action of the London Council in this matter, follows the intention of the Ministers who brought in the Local Government Bill. Mr. Walter Long, Mr. Ritchie’s immediate subordinate, in a letter read before the Oxfordshire Council, distinctly

laid it down that aldermen should be chosen from the outside. Upon which the Oxfordshire Council elected a Tory list, throwing in Sir Bernhard Samuelson, M.P., just to be able to say that they were not quite exclusive. In Leicestershire the same thing was done, but in Lancashire the Council elected as aldermen only members already chosen by the constituencies, so that every member of the Council as now constituted has passed through the mill of a popular election. In this connection it may be mentioned that Rossendale, being divided into five districts, sends as many Liberals to the Council, and that Lord Hartington's most powerful political friends were beaten at the polls. Among the "aldermen" for London is a lady—Miss Cons—who has done much excellent philanthropic work in the district of Lambeth. The whole question of the eligibility of women will probably come before the Courts, Mr. Beresford-Hope having petitioned against the return of Lady Sandhurst for the Brixton division of London.

Mr. Parnell has failed in his Scotch action for libel against the *Times*, the technical objections raised by the defendants having been upheld. An action has now been commenced in the Dublin Courts, and the *Times*, which was always crying to Mr. Parnell to "come on," will, no doubt, do its best to prevent a trial in the Irish capital. The Irish leader must, however, be abundantly consoled. At the time of writing, we are in the very crisis of the inquiry of the Special Commission. The *Times* has at length been brought to the great matter of the alleged Parnell letters, and its friends are vastly alarmed at the result. A more amazing story was never heard. Mr. Soames, the *Times*' solicitor, told us that he received the letters supposed to incriminate the Irish leader, with others from Mr. Macdonald, the manager of the *Times*; that he asked no questions, but that he thoroughly believed they were genuine. Mr. Macdonald, in his turn, revealed the fact that the letters were brought to him by Mr. Houston, an officer of the Irish Loyal and Patriotic Union; that he also asked no questions as to the source of their origin, because it was said to be a secret; but "he quite believed the letters were authentic *from the first*." Indeed, according to Mr. Macdonald, the alleged Parnell letters were just the sort of letters which the Irish leader might be expected to write. The *Times* took one precaution, and one precaution only. They submitted the letters to an expert in handwriting, whose evidence we have not yet had; but who, having entered the box, may be taken as ready to swear in a sense favourable to the theory of Mr. Soames and Mr. Macdonald. Then we arrived at the grand secret through Mr. Houston. This young gentleman has a mission. Convinced of the diabolical character of Mr. Parnell, and of the awful catastrophe impending upon the State under the guise of Home Rule, he determined to do a great stroke for his association, and, at the same time, to earn for himself a niche in the Temple of Fame. Fortune threw him in the way of Mr. Richard Pigott, a necessitous

journalist and an avowed Fenian, who, about ten years ago, sold his Fenian newspaper, published at Dublin, to the leaders of the Irish party. This person was commissioned, on the strength of his former acquaintance with Irish politicians, to seek evidence which would prove them guilty of actual crime. Mr. Houston was not a moneyed man himself, but Lord Stalbridge (better known as Lord R. Grosvenor, a former Liberal "whip"), Sir R. Blennerhassett, and Dr. Maguire, of Trinity College, Dublin, gave considerable financial help, the advances, being, as we understand it, paid back when Mr. Houston finally struck his bargain with the *Times*. Equipped with ample funds, Mr. Houston sent Pigott twice to Lausanne, then to Paris and the United States, and again to Paris several times. The result was that, with a comparatively brief interval between each delivery, Mr. Houston came into possession of three separate batches of letters. Mr. Houston and Dr. Maguire went to Paris and got the first batch, including the Parnell letters, almost direct from those who held them, since Mr. Pigott brought them from a lower room of the hotel to the apartment occupied by his employers, and actually obtained cash down to take to his friends waiting below for payment. These friends were, however, not observed—it was suggested that there should be no attempt to watch them, or even to look at them, and Mr. Houston and Dr. Maguire carefully followed the suggestion. They were quite content with what they had got for £500. Mr. Houston, indeed, tells us that it was his earnest desire to avoid all appearance of any association with Pigott, who for this reason was always paid, not by cheque, but in notes and gold. In pursuance of this same policy Houston thought it best not to know too much of Pigott's relations with other people, and he did not seek the details of the finding of the letters. So far from pressing for information on this head, he resolutely refrained from inquiry. Yet he never doubted that the letters were genuine. He trusted Pigott without any sort of reserve, and it was only when Pigott had been closeted with "the other side" in the house of Mr. Labouchere that an abounding faith began to waver. Then a statutory declaration, readily made by Pigott, put agent and principal once more upon excellent terms.

It will be observed that up to this point there was no definite information as to how the letters came into the hands of Pigott. Upon Pigott everything turned. Houston trusted in Pigott, the *Times* in Houston. And so it was established that, without any sort of inquiry whatever—for we cannot accept the opinion of an expert in handwriting, standing by itself, as of any value—the *Times* gave to the world, with all the authority of its high position, its now famous letters, making itself wholly responsible for what, if dishonest, constituted the most ruthless moral assassination ever perpetrated upon

a political adversary.<sup>1</sup> In the present state of the case, we may not say how far Mr. Pigott has convinced us of the authenticity of the letters, for which the handsome sum of £1250 was actually paid, with other bills for "expenses," &c., running up to a total altogether of £4600. Our readers will judge of the nature of the proof for themselves, but they will probably agree that Mr. Parnell has no longer any occasion for anxiety. By the side of this matter of the letters, the evidence of Major Le Caron, "the military spy" of the British Government among the Irish revolutionaries in America, has almost faded from memory. Through Le Caron the *Times* made a clever attempt to connect Mr. Parnell and his political friends with the physical force and dynamite party, but before we can safely judge upon this matter we must hear the other side. In regard to the facts, we go simply upon the evidence of the *Times*' own witnesses and what has been said.

The prosecution of the Bishop of Lincoln by the Church Association is much condemned. Bishop King is a man of broad and tolerant mind, and in going to the various churches of his diocese he has made it a rule to accept the practice which he finds in existence. He wears cope and mitre, as he may on his interpretation of the rubrics, but it can hardly be said that he has given open encouragement to illegality. Now he is cited before his Metropolitan for taking part in the celebration of the Communion at the Church of St. Peter at Lincoln. Here the mixed chalice and altar lights are used, the vessels are publicly "cleansed," the eastward position and the elevation of the Host are observed, and the *Agnus Dei* and *Benedictus* are sung during the Communion. How far the Bishop has made himself responsible in respect of any of these "points" remains to be seen. He has taken objection to the jurisdiction of the Archbishop's Court—which has been in suspense for two hundred years—and demands a trial before the Synod of Bishops of the Southern province. Upon this point argument is to be heard on March 12. That the Archbishop has not himself vetoed the prosecution is matter of surprise to many good Churchmen who are not of the high sacerdotal party.

We wind up by recording the gratifying fact, just to hand, that the East Perthshire election has gone well, spite of the urgent appeal for a reduction of the Liberal majority, made on the spot by Mr. Chamberlain. We have but held our own, it is true; but we have held our own by a majority which has risen to 1716 from 1309 in 1886. And this, too, though the Tory-Unionist candidate has also polled more votes than before.

<sup>1</sup> Written before Pigott's disappearance.

# THE AMERICAN STRUGGLE OF LAST CENTURY, AND THE IRISH STRUGGLE OF TO-DAY.

## A COMPARISON.

THERE is a striking resemblance in several important features between the circumstances attending the struggle of the American Colonies of last century against the oppression of the English Government, and the circumstances which attend the struggle of the Irish to-day. A brief notice of these points may prove interesting and not unprofitable.

We take first the alleged causes of the disturbances. With regard to the Irish troubles, the present Government maintains that there is no just cause for them, that they are due mainly to a few unscrupulous agitators who hold the whole population in subjection by means of an organized system of terrorism, and that the sole immediate duty of the Executive Government is to break the power of these men, and restore to the country the blessings of law and liberty. As against this, the present Opposition maintains that the Irish grievances are real, that the object of the agitation is constitutional in its character, and that the assertion that the disturbances are due to the tyranny of a few unscrupulous individuals is obviously false and absurd. The Irish have been driven by the oppression of the Government to a vindication of their rights, and, by an invincible perseverance in an unjust course of conduct, to the adoption of methods not consistent either with law or liberty. Compare with these views the views of Ministers and Opposition in the time of George III. as to the causes of the American troubles. In the King's Speech at the opening of Parliament on the 31st October 1776, the following passages occur: "Nothing could have afforded me so much gratification as to have been able to inform you that the troubles which have so long distracted my colonies in North America were at an end; and that my unhappy people, recovered from their delusion, had delivered themselves from the oppression of their leaders, and returned to their duty. But so daring and so desperate is the spirit of those leaders, whose object has always been dominion and power, that they have now openly renounced all allegiance to the Crown, and

all political connection with this country. In this arduous contest I can have no other object but to promote the true interests of all my subjects. No people ever enjoyed more happiness or lived under a milder form of government than those now revolted provinces. . . . My desire is to restore to them the blessings of law and liberty equally enjoyed by every British subject, which they have so desperately exchanged for all the calamities of war and the arbitrary tyranny of their chiefs." Here, as in the case of the Irish troubles of to-day, we have the Government claiming for itself a mild administration of the law, and tracing the disturbances solely to the tyranny of a few individuals "whose object has always been dominion and power;" and we have it laid down as the single duty of the Executive to destroy the power of these men and to restore to the mass of the people the enjoyment of a mild form of government, and the blessings of law and liberty.

The speeches in support of the Address repeat in various forms this view of the causes of the troubles. In the House of Lords, the Earl of Carlisle, who moved the Address, said that "the nation had been brought into its present critical situation by the acts of designing, ambitious men." Lord Cardiff, in supporting the Address, said "the deluded people of America had been inflamed, misled, and hurried on by their leaders." And, in the House of Commons, Solicitor-General Wedderburn said, "The Congress does not govern America—it tyrannizes over it; the power and punishment of imprisonment as practised there, are tyrannical to the highest degree, and utterly inconsistent with every idea of freedom. The liberty of the Press is annihilated: a printer that dared to print anything contrary to their system and interests would be utterly ruined; nor is even the freedom of private letters or private conversation permitted; destruction hangs over the man who ventures to write or express a sentiment in opposition to their opinions. This horrid tyranny is what we may rationally hope to be so far dissolved by the measures of Government as to enable the oppressed, tyrannized Americans safely to avow their real opinions, and to return without danger to their duty." From this latter extract it is evident that boycotting, of a very severe kind, was as prominent a feature of the American struggle as it is of the Irish struggle. Another member of the House of Commons, in supporting the Address, censured the Americans as "a body of bragging, cowardly banditti." Here is a gem after the very best manner of Unionist oratory, and we commend the phrase to the attention of the speakers of the party for future use in ~~their~~ descriptions of the Irish.

An amendment to the Address was drawn up by Burke, and moved in the House of Lords by the Marquis of Rockingham, and in the House of Commons by Lord John Cavendish. This amendment, among other things, that nothing but gross ignorance of human

nature or a spirit of adulation could induce the House to represent to his Majesty that the revolt of a whole people could possibly happen without some considerable error in the conduct which had been held towards them. In supporting the amendment the Opposition directed special attention to the last sentence quoted above from the Speech. They asked where the mighty leaders were to be found whom the Americans obeyed so implicitly, and who also governed them with so iron a rule? It was pointed out that not one of these leaders possessed any eminence or authority over the people till their troubles had singled them out as capable men. Mr. Washington, for example, possessed such a landed estate as several very private gentlemen in every county in England possess, which enables them to exhibit such a degree of hospitality as procures them respect and regard in their own districts without their being heard of or known beyond these limits. Others who now figure in the field were, and would have continued, still more obscure. By what magic is it then, it was asked, that a whole people who are represented as lawless, who are said to abhor all those distinctions which custom and authority have established in other parts of the world, should all at once have changed their nature so as to resign their faculties of thinking and powers of activity to a few unknown despots? The answer was obvious, and it was merely this, that the assertion was false, and that it was at the same time so palpably absurd as not to merit a serious refutation. The Americans, forced together by oppression, were under the necessity which all people ever have been, and must ever continue to be, of adopting leaders. Thus these supposed tyrants who are represented as trampling equally upon all laws and upon the necks of the people, as governing them with rods of scorpions, and practising upon them a despotism scarcely known in the oldest established tyrannies, are no other than leaders appointed at their will and removable at their pleasure. One speaker, Mr. Townshend, put the whole view thus: "I think I have heard a few old women say that the Civil War of last century was originally contrived by Cromwell; that the first opposition to Charles I. was begun in order to advance Cromwell to the protectorship. It is a sagacity and penetration of the same kind that has now happily discovered the original views of those who are now the leaders of the Americans." The sagacity and penetration which the Unionists claim for themselves in their judgment of the Irish leaders may, without much uncharitableness, be compared to that of these "old women."

So much for the causes of the disturbances. The next point to be mentioned is the attitude of the two Governments with regard to proposals of conciliation. On this point the Unionists maintain that no concession, no attempt at conciliation, can be made till the power of the National League is destroyed and the claim for Home Rule abandoned. An unconditional submission is the necessary pre-



liminary to any consideration of grievance. In other words, the Irish are called upon to acknowledge, by unconditional surrender, that their agitation has been unjust and unnecessary, and that they should have relied upon the good intentions of the Imperial Executive and the Imperial Legislature. As against this, the Opposition maintains that the condition thus laid down is inhuman, and a supremely insolent condition. The Irish assert that the Imperial Parliament has sanctioned and maintained legislative measures which have brought innumerable woes to their country; they have become hopeless of obtaining adequate redress from Parliament, and they therefore ask for power to deal with their own concerns. For answer they are baldly told, without circumlocution of any kind, that they must submit themselves to Parliament. This is the very attitude assumed by the Ministers of George III. We take as an illustration their statements in the debate of November 6, 1776, on the motion of Lord John Cavendish, "That the House should resolve itself into a Committee to consider the revisal of all Acts of Parliament by which his Majesty's subjects in America think themselves aggrieved."

The Ministers opposed the motion on the ground that no revision could take place till the Americans had renounced their claims of independency, and again submitted themselves to Parliament. The question of independence must first be settled as a preliminary before any treaty could be entered into or any concession made. Lord North, in stating his reasons for giving a negative to the motion, made use of language that is almost word for word the same as that used over and over again by the Marquis of Hartington, Mr. Chamberlain, and other Tory leaders, in speaking of the Irish. He said: "The Americans have declared themselves independent; why enter into deliberation about what you are willing to concede, till we first know that they acknowledge our authority; and, after they have returned to us as subjects, till we know what would reasonably content them? How is it possible to form legislative regulations for those who all along have disputed our power and right of legislation?" In the debate it was again declared that Congress held America enthralled under the most cruel tyranny; that there was little doubt, from the success of the Government policy, that this arbitrary Government would soon be destroyed, and that then the great body of the people, finding themselves emancipated from the cruel yoke of their leaders, would return to their duty with as much rapidity as they had before entered into the revolt. This being once effected, Government would, it was declared, be ready to adopt the most efficacious measures, not only to remedy real grievances, but even to bend to their prejudices in some instances. This is a policy in all respects like that pursued by the Government of to-day; and it has, no doubt, the merit of being quite consistent with that view of the origin of the troubles which traces them mainly to the malign influence of a few corrupt

and seditious men. As to the issue of the policy, it is worth noting that the same view of its success was entertained by the Ministers of George III. at a time when it was already hopelessly defeated, as is now entertained by the Unionists in reference to the policy of her Majesty's Government. It is interesting also to note the reply of the Opposition to the view that no concession could be made, or negotiation entered into, with the Americans until the spirit of independence was subdued. It was, they said, a doctrine founded on cruelty and crying out for blood. It was telling them in express terms that they must either surrender all their claims and submit to any conditions which it was thought right to impose upon them, or that they must endure the utmost extremities of war, and fight it out to the last man. The Duke of Richmond, speaking in the House of Lords, mentioned the several measures adopted by the King's servants against America, and reminded their Lordships that the consequences from the beginning to the very close of the last Session were almost literally foretold by those who disapproved of them; that there was something very remarkable, however, in this combination of cause and effect; for while the Opposition predicted the probable operation those coercive laws would produce, they did not neglect to remind Ministers that they supposed those laws were expressly enacted for that purpose; if so, though such a conduct might well serve to impeach the justice of the measures, it proved that they were not so much the effect of ignorance as of design. America had the alternative to submit, or to abide the event of resistance; the several oppressive laws spoke that language; and as America refused to submit to terms of unconditional submission, she was, of course, compelled to declare herself independent. In that point of view Ministers had been successful, and gained what they secretly wished for, though they did not dare openly to avow it; they put all on the issue of a trial of strength between the parties, in which struggle they flatter themselves they shall prevail. Are not Ministers now putting all on the issue of a trial of strength between the parties, and do they not also flatter themselves that they shall prevail? As to the view that it would be useless to consider any scheme of concession "till we know what would reasonably content them," it was held then, as in similar circumstances it is held now, to be a mere excuse for postponing consideration of the question till victory had been gained, and the question could be solved in accordance with the views of Government.

The third point to which we refer is the attitude of agitators with regard to remedial measures actually brought forward and the comments of Ministers on the reception given to these measures. It has constantly been asserted in the House of Commons, in the Press, and on the platform, that the Irish leaders have opposed such measures as the Arrears Bill of 1887, the Drainage Bills of last Session, and

the vote of £5,000,000 for carrying on the provisions of Lord Ashbourne's Act, because the action of these measures would tend to put an end to their power and destroy their trade as agitators. The Irishmen themselves, on the other hand, maintain that their opposition was a disinterested and legitimate one. They say that the proposed remedies were either so long delayed as to be altogether inadequate to meet growing evils, or that they were framed on an erroneous view of the causes of the evils, or lastly, that they were merely pretended remedies and such as would bring no benefit to the great body of the people. In precisely the same spirit as that shown by the Government now in reference to the present troubles, the addresses of both Houses in reply to the King's Speech quoted above, expressly attribute the insolence of the American leaders in rejecting the means of conciliation held out by his Majesty to an insatiable thirst of power and dominion, and to the fear that the acceptance of them would destroy their authority. Whether the rejection by the Americans of these means of conciliation was really due to the cause thus assigned has long ago been settled by history.

The next point is the contention that the Opposition is animated solely by the spirit of faction. It is unnecessary to recall particular instances in which, in the present struggle, Ministers and their supporters have charged the Opposition with fanning the Irish discontent for purely party purposes, and with encouraging the Irish in such a course of conduct as would tend to make the government of Ireland difficult and dangerous. The most recent instance of the kind is the assertion that the agitation in England over the treatment of political prisoners has been unscrupulously manufactured by the party leaders for party purposes. Here is a passage from a speech delivered by the Earl of Carlisle in the House of Lords in 1776, in which he states his view of the tactics of the Opposition at that time. It is a continuation of the passage which we have already given from his speech in moving the Address. After observing that the nation had been brought into its present critical situation by the acts of designing, ambitious men, he went on to say that, "while he lamented the influence the leaders in America had over their infatuated brethren, he could not help remarking that the daring and open hostilities which preceded their declaration of independency would never have happened if that disobedient traitorous spirit had not been nourished by a set of men in this country, who, deserting its interests, shamefully sacrificed them to their personal views of faction and ambition." Lord Derby also, in the same year, lamented the factious spirit, both here and in America, "which has been the cause of the present melancholy state of public affairs." On the general charge that the disturbances were due to faction, it may be worth while to quote the following passage from an address to the King, which was drawn up by Burke

for the Whig party at the beginning of 1777, but which was never presented: "We cannot attribute so much to the power of faction, at the expense of human nature, as to suppose, that in any part of the world, a combination of men, few in number, not considerable in rank, of no hereditary dependencies, should be able, by the efforts of their policy alone, or the mere exertion of any talents, to bring the people of your American dominions into the disposition which has produced the present troubles. . . . This we conceive could never have happened but from a general sense of some grievance, so radical in its nature and so spreading in its effect, as to poison all the ordinary satisfactions of life, to discompose the frame of society, and to convert into fear and hatred that habitual reverence paid by mankind to an ancient and venerable Government."

We come now to the last point which we propose to mention—namely, the division of opinion in the country on the merits of the dispute. The struggle on the Irish question has been characterized as one in which the "classes" are engaged on the one side, and the "masses" on the other; and it is certain that the preponderating opinion of the well-to-do in the community is with the Tories, and that the Liberals look for support mainly to the working-class electors. Even among these electors opinion on the question of Home Rule at the time of the 1886 election was not, at least in England, very unequally divided; and the election resulted in the return of a great majority against the Liberal policy. The division of opinion on the American question was in all respects analogous to this. Mr. Lecky in his *History of England* states that the preponderating opinion of the most powerful classes in the community was with the King and with his Ministers; and Lord Camden, writing in February 1775, said that he was grieved to observe that the landed interest was almost altogether anti-American. The Established Church was strenuously anti-American, and the bishops voted steadily for measures of coercion. The two Universities presented addresses on the same side; and the addresses from the great towns in favour of the Government were both more numerous and more largely signed than those which opposed it. By way of accounting for this, it has been said that the cause of the Americans was founded on a principle too extensive to be estimated by the multitude and too liberal and humane to be tolerated by the Tories. In Parliament, opinion was divided even more disproportionately than in the country. In the House of Commons divisions not unfrequently went in favour of the Government by almost three to one, and in the House of Lords by almost four to one. On the Irish question the disproportion of opinion in the House of Commons is not so great; but in the House of Lords, for reasons easily understood, it is even greater.

In drawing practical lessons from this parallel it must not be forgotten that in 1776, as for long afterwards, the merits of the dispute

in the case of America were as much the subject of debate as they are now in the case of Ireland. The verdict of history had still to be pronounced in the one case, just as now it has still to be pronounced in the other. What we have to notice is that widespread disorders are in both cases traced by Ministers to precisely the same causes. In both cases, precisely the same spirit is said to animate the leaders of the disturbances. The coercive nature of the policy by which these disorders are to be got rid of is in each case the same. In each case, the same spirit of faction is attributed to those who oppose the Ministerial policy. And lastly, in each case, the coercive policy, and that view of the cause of the disorders from which the policy springs, are supported by much the same strength of opinion in Parliament and in the country. History tells us now that George III. and his Ministers and their supporters, even though they were the educated and the well-to-do of the country, were from first to last in the wrong both as to their diagnosis of the disease and as to their treatment. Is there anything to justify us in believing that the Tory majority of to-day is wiser, or better able to calculate the causes of national disturbances and the effects of coercion, than the Tory majority of 1776 ; or that the Liberal minority of to-day is less wise and less far-seeing than the Whig minority of 1776 ? If not, what is likely to be the verdict of history with regard to the Tory policy in Ireland ?

## MARRIED WOMEN :

### AN HISTORICAL SKETCH.

THIS subject has so often been investigated and discussed, and its various phases considered in detail by all classes of writers, that some hesitation might be expected in one who proposes to again tax the patience of his readers. But although the majority of intelligent people at the present day have ample opportunities of determining such questions as marriage with a deceased wife's sister, the sacrament of marriage, the social and political status of women and other kindred dubieties, it is only by considerable research that facts can be obtained as to the steps by which the freedom of married women has been accomplished. This may partly be due to the fact that the subject has principally been dealt with by lawyers : who have always been excusably reticent in parting gratuitously with legal information. Numberless are the works, ancient and modern, on the laws relating to married women ; but they have been written almost without exception for the benefit of the profession, and are not intended for the ordinary reader. Therefore it may not be uninteresting to look back for a time, and watch the progress of civilization from the time of practical slavery to the present date, when unrestrained liberty is being demanded by or for every class of people. As is well known, much of our legal system was originally borrowed from Rome : though it is extremely doubtful whether its arts and learning affected this country in any appreciable degree during the four centuries it was a tributary to the Empire. Not until Romanism was accepted in the person of Augustine in lieu of the Catholicism brought from Ireland do we find any improvement in the morality of the people ; and even then advance was tardy, and for years religion and education only existed in name. But from that time the ecclesiastics applied themselves to establish the Christian religion and the laws and civilization of the land they had left. So far as the laws are concerned, the only effect it produced was to humanize and improve the general tone of the people ; but, in later times, when order was restored and trade and commerce were found to be of some importance, men began to study the most perfect system of jurisprudence then known. The Law of the

Twelve Tables, dating from the fifth century before Christ and recognized as the starting-point of all subsequent development, was enlarged upon and improved by successive Emperors; and in the year A.D. 529 the Roman Law was finally perfected and codified by a great legislative reformer, the Emperor Justinian.

Our own legislation is of quite a recent date, but the old Common Law was about the middle of the twelfth century superseded by the learning brought from Rome. It may therefore be useful to glance at the position of a married woman both under the Roman Republic and Empire.

Every family relation in Rome arose from the system of dividing the *gens* into separate and distinct *familia*. Over each familia the reign of the paterfamilias was autocratic and absolute. Not only were children *in potestate*, but slaves, descendants of children and, during the Republic, the wife. Before marriage, the father, or it may have been the grandfather, of a woman held this position; or if she had been emancipated, she herself would represent a separate familia. On marriage, a woman might have remained in her former family, becoming an *uxor* or matron, or she could have joined the family of her husband, becoming a *materfamilias* by passing into the *manus* (hand) of her husband. The latter was in earlier times the recognized and usually adopted course. *Manus* could be acquired in one of three methods: patricians were particular to observe a sacred ceremony called *confarreatio*, when a cake of spelt (a kind of wheat) was partaken of; but this was formal, and, owing to the heavy fees demanded, costly; and in its place the lower orders employed either *coemptio*, a fictitious sale before five witnesses, or more often *usus*, which meant merely the uninterrupted use for a whole year. *Manus* over the wife seems to have been almost identical with *potestas* over the children and slaves, with the exceptions that the husband had not the absolute right of destruction or alienation: and his powers of chastisement were in some few instances limited. As there was a complete personal subordination, so, as we might expect, there was also a relinquishment of all rights respecting property. The *dos* which was brought by the wife on marriage became, in the earlier period, the property of her husband; although we find that before long this was limited to the enjoyment of the usufruct during coverture. Fathers made provision for the return of the *dos* after the dissolution of coverture, when it was no longer useful for the purposes for which it was given—viz., to support the expenses of the marriage; and, indeed, strangers or the woman herself could adopt the same course. And, by the time of Justinian, the husband was merely considered as a trustee of the *dos* for the benefit of his wife, without any express reservation to that effect.

Also, about this time, a new arrangement was invented which in some measure resembled our marriage settlement. In return for

the *dos* the husband was expected to make a correlative contribution in favour of the wife, to which were attached the same rights as to user and recovery as were incidental to the *dos*. But even prior to the Empire, when the *manus* existed in its most tyrannical form, a married woman was not positively incapable of acquiring and holding property. Like the children and slaves, she might hold as separate estate *peculium* (diminutive of *pecunia*), which consisted of any property either saved from earnings or given to her, and which her husband permitted her to keep with the intention that it should become her own.

It will be seen that the position of a married woman who had passed under the *manus* was anything but desirable; and although the status might have been broken by taking the proper steps, with the husband's consent, of course, it was always an object to effect the marriage without inflicting upon the woman such grievous wrongs. This was done in the case of the lower orders by avoiding any ceremony at all; and, in order to prevent the right from arising by *usus*, the wife absented herself from her husband's house for three consecutive nights in every year. Marriage was always regarded as a purely civil contract, and required no ceremony to perfect it. Provided the consent of the *paterfamilias*, if any, and of the betrothed parties was obtained, and the wife delivered to her husband, the marriage was valid. It differed but slightly from the perfectly legal connection, *concubinatus*. Both were monogamous, both were ties formed for life, unless earlier dissolved by either of the parties, and they both came within the laws against the union of cognates and agnates.

But the concubine did not take the status of her partner, nor did the offspring come under the father's potestas; she had no right to join in the sacred rites of the family. The latter disability was, under the Christian Emperors, removed by subsequent marriage. Marriage by mere consent, however, was not sufficient to satisfy the great patricians who considered it unbecoming to marry without the imposing ceremonies of *confarreatio*. This method had practically become obsolete at the commencement of the Christian era, but was revived by a rather curious circumstance. The priesthood of Jove (*flamen dialis*) had been without occupants for nearly seventy-five years, when it was renewed by Augustine, B.C. 10. These priests could only be recruited from children whose parents had been married by the sacred ceremony of *confarreatio*. The hardships attaching to *manus* had so prevented women passing *in manu* that, in the year 23, the Emperor Tiberias found that, in order to secure the necessary number of candidates, he must remove the disabilities attaching to the *manus* acquired by this form of marriage. And, consequently, from that time a woman might by *confarreatio* pass into the familia of her husband, and enjoy all the privileges of



domestic relations and domestic gods, without the penalties which formerly attached. As the marriage was formed by mere intention, so it might also be dissolved without any form or ceremony. This was certainly the case until the sixth century, when a written Bill of Divorce, witnessed by seven Roman citizens, was required by statute. Not only could the husband divorce his wife, but the wife her husband, if she were emancipated; and, if she were still under her father's potestas, he could recall her even against the consent of both parties. It was unnecessary to assign any reason for the separation until about 300, when successive Emperors imposed some slight restrictions; the principal effect of which was, not to avoid the divorce, but to alter the rights under the marriage settlement. Such are the leading features of the Roman Law concerning husband and wife, down to the middle of the sixth century.

There can be no question that these laws had no influence on the Danish marauders who conquered Britain, nor subsequently on the Norman invaders. And in those times a married woman must have been as fully in the position of a slave as a woman under the manus. She was a chattel, a thing, and of so little value that the law did not recognize her existence. Nevertheless, Dr. Lingard says, in his *History of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, vol. ii. p. 7, note: "It is clear, however, from accidental notices in the laws, and in wills, which have come down to us, that the husband and wife held separate estates during marriage." There appears to have been a crude custom of the husband giving a present, called *morgengifu*, to his wife on the morning after the consummation of the marriage: but there is some doubt whether she had any power to hold it as her own property, much less to enforce it as a right. The Welsh had, at the time of the Norman invasion, a clearly defined code respecting married women and their property. All the household furniture and domestic utensils, even the milking pans and bedclothes, were apportioned by law; and husband and wife traded and contracted with each other as they thought fit. The following quaint provisions will show that this is so.

In Book II. chap. i. of the Venedotian Code, published about 1080, we read: "The three peculiars of a woman; her cowyll, her gowyn, and her saraad; the reason they are called three peculiars is because they are the three properties of a woman and cannot be taken from her; her cowyll is what she receives for her maidenhood; her saraad is for every beating given to her by her husband, except for three things; and those three, for which she may be beaten, are for giving anything which she ought not to give; for being detected with another man in a covert; and for wishing drivel on his beard; and if, for being found with another man, he chastised her, he is not to have any satisfaction besides that; for there ought not to be both satisfaction and vengeance for the same crime; her gowyn is, if she

detect her husband with another woman let him pay her six score pence for the first offence, for the second one pound; and, if she detect him a third time, she can separate from him without losing anything that belongs to her; and the property she may obtain for the above three things is to be apart from her husband." Again, in the 18th chapter of the Second Book of the Dimetian Code, of 1180, it is written: "If a wife utter a harsh or disgraceful word to her husband, let her pay to her husband three kine as camlwrw, for he is her lord; or let him strike her three blows with a rod of his cubit length on any part he will, excepting her head." Picture the sturdy Welshman in doubt and uncertainty whether he would derive greater satisfaction from the three cows or the three blows; and finally deciding in favour of the three cows, owing to the limitation placed on the length of rod.

Regarding England, little can be definitely asserted of the Anglo-Saxon period, as the data are insufficient and unreliable, but later we are on more solid ground. In early times the only possessions that were of any value were lands; and under the feudal tenures, any interest, even in lands, less than an estate lasting for life, was considered only fit for those who had not the status of a freeman. Hence it is that we can find in the older writers more accurate information about real property than of personalty: Glanvil, who wrote about 1181, in the reign of Henry II., was the father of our legal text writers, and he was followed some eighty years later by Bracton and others. The greatest work of authority on the Common Law is Littleton on Tenures, written about 1456; which was, in 1638, edited by Lord Coke, who has left us his invaluable Commentaries on it. From these treatises and others of the like purport we can gather with some degree of accuracy what rights and liabilities a married woman had at Common Law. We find that she is no longer considered as a mere commodity, but that she has, in many respects, a distinct entity, to which were attached rights capable of being enforced. Although it has always been, and still is, a fundamental theory of the law that man and wife are but one person, or, as Bracton wrote some 600 years ago, "*Vir et uxor sunt quasi unica persona, quia caro una et sanguis unus*," yet it has never been applicable to all cases, but principally to those affecting property. As, for instance, a married woman could always succeed to dignities. The office of hereditary High Sheriff of Westmoreland was held by Ann, Countess of Pembroke, Dorset, and Montgomery, while under coverture. It was decided, temp. Elizabeth, by Lord Burleigh, that a husband could not acquire the dignity or offices of his wife, nor take an estate by courtesy in them. She had always a distinct personality in the commission of crimes; though, at the present day, there is a presumption in some cases that she acted under the influence of her husband, if he were present. Again, a woman can act apart from her husband, so

as to bind him in a contract, if he has given her an authority express or implied; and, in the same way, she might make a valid will, provided she obtained her husband's consent. Bracton, however, seems to have thought that this consent was, under certain circumstances, not indispensable, for he says: "Si mulier fuerit subpotestate viri constituta testamenti factionem non habebit absque viri sui voluntate propter honestatem. Tamem receptum est quandoque quod testamentum facere possit de rationabile parte quam habitura esset si virum supervixisset et maxima de rebus sibi dabis et concessis ad ornamentum quæ sua propria dici poterunt, sicut de robis et jocalibus." The theory of unity was, however, applied rigidly in all cases where property was concerned. It was on this account that gifts between husband and wife were absolutely void; although later they might have taken effect as separate estate, which they now are, by the Act of 1882. The personal property of which a married woman was possessed at the time of the marriage, or might afterwards acquire, passed into the hands of her husband. To such an extent was the right of the husband to his wife's property upheld, that if, during the treaty for marriage, a woman parted with property unknown to her future husband, he could pursue and recover it. This, in early times, was no great hardship, as very little value was attached to any property not consisting of land. But if the personality was not a tangible thing in possession, but was a mere chose in action, a thing which was only valuable as a right to recover by action—debts, for instance—the husband would not take any interest in it, unless he had reduced it into possession during coverture.

A married woman had also an interest in another kind of property, though it would be incorrect to say that she could hold it. Paraphernalia, though differing in some respects, was an adaptation of the Roman *parapherna*, which was a reservation from the *dos* for the use of the wife. It consisted of articles given to a woman by her husband for her own use or ornament. During the life of her husband, she had no property in them; they were in his disposition, and he could sell or part with them as he pleased. If undisposed of at his death, they became the property of the widow; but still subject to the debts of the deceased. Such gifts would, since the Act of 1882, become separate property, and be beyond the reach of the husband or his creditors, unless the transfer was fraudulent.

Of a far different description were the laws governing the destination of real estate. Here was a kind of property that the people of that day could appreciate and value; and therefore we find greater restrictions on its alienation. The harsh and unjust rules derived from a mixed source, Norman and Danish, were made to give way to the more beneficent principles of the Roman Law, which was beginning to be felt in all parts of the country. Therefore

the husband was not permitted to absolutely deprive his wife of all benefit in her real estate. If she possessed an estate of freehold—*i.e.*, an estate lasting at least for life—it passed to her husband on marriage, and he received the rents and profits during coverture; but he could not dispose of it, and, on his death, it reverted to his widow, or her heirs. If they wished to alienate, they could do so jointly by a cumbrous machinery called a fine, levied in the Court of Common Pleas, which procedure lasted as late as 1733; when an Act was passed abolishing fines, and making a simple deed sufficient, if the wife was separately examined as to her concurrence. But a distinction was drawn between freeholds and estates less than freeholds, as leaseholds. During the Norman period lands were generally granted for life, and any less estate was not considered by a freeman to be worth holding. On this account, leaseholds and chattels savouring of the realty—timber, for instance—were placed in a middle position; and, although they passed to the husband, and he could dispose of them in his lifetime, he could not bequeath them by will, nor were they liable after his death for his debts.

This may perhaps be the most convenient place to notice two estates which have played an important part in the subject under discussion—*viz.*, dower and courtesy. Dower was an estate for life, taken by the wife on the death of her husband for the maintenance of herself and the younger children. It only arose out of lands of which the husband was solely seised during coverture. In the absence of stipulation, it usually amounted to a third part of such lands; and the wife must have had issue born inheritable. A curious case is recorded which arose in Elizabeth's reign, as to whether a man was solely seised or not. A father and son held property jointly; so that, on the death of either, it would be solely possessed by the survivor. But both were hanged at the same time out of the same cart. In this dilemma, the widow claimed her dower, and it was granted on evidence that the father's legs were seen to quiver after his son was dead. Dower was borrowed from the Roman *dos*, and was adopted by the feudal owners in order to provide maintenance for the wife and younger children; because, otherwise, the feud, which included practically the entire possessions, passing to the heir by the law of primogeniture, they would have been left without support.

In Kent, a widow would have taken one-half and retained it, not for life, but while unmarried and chaste; while in towns where the custom of borough English prevailed, she would take the entirety for life.

Besides these, Littleton mentions three others: *Ad ostium ecclesiæ: ex assensu patris; de la plus beale (plus belle)*. The old learning on this subject is but seldom of any importance, as,

by the Dower Act of 1833 it only applies to persons married before the 1st January 1834, or in the case of a man dying intestate without having made any declaration to bar dower; that Act also abolished the three kinds last mentioned.

Tenancy by the courtesy of England arises when a man marries a woman solely seised in fee of lands, and has issue by her born in her lifetime, and capable of inheriting. It existed in Rome, Germany, France, and Scotland; and was introduced into England and Ireland during the reign of Henry I. This estate may still be claimed, but a question may arise whether the Act of 1882 has affected it so as to bar the right.

We have now traced our subject through what may be termed its Common Law existence, and have next to consider the most important revolution in regard to a married woman's property—the creation of her separate estate. In the reign of Henry VI. the Court of Chancery began to temper the harshness of the Common Law with equity, and assumed a jurisdiction over matters which were not cognizable in a court of law. By the time of Henry VIII. it was firmly established as a *forum conscientie*, and adopted as its special care, trust estates. The connection between trust estates and separate estates may not be at once apparent; but the one arose out of the other. A trust need not be expressed, but is often implied. The Court said, in effect, to the husband, "You hold at Common Law property which has been given to your wife for her own; and, though we cannot divest you of the legal estate in it, we will consider that there is an implied trust that you hold it for the benefit of your wife." Although separate use arose as soon as the equitable doctrine of trusts had become securely rooted, there is no reported case of a woman holding property separately from her husband until the time of Elizabeth in 1581. It was claimed in Ireland in 1605, but was negatived by all the judges. Later it came to be considered, not as a mere trust estate, but as a separate estate which the wife might herself hold, and was recognized as such in the courts of law. Although justice was now meted out to a certain extent, it was found that it had brought little real advantage; for the marital influence was such that a husband could usually "coax or bully" his wife into making any disposition he wished. To avoid this, Lord Tharlow, who was a trustee of a marriage settlement in 1791, invented the plan of what is known as restraint on anticipation. He inserted in the settlement words to the effect that the wife was to be restrained from anticipating the receipt of her property; and this provision was upheld by the Courts of Equity. This was as great an infringement on the law that a person may dispose at will of all his property, as separate estate itself was on the law that a woman's property passed to her husband. But, as equity had created separate estate, it claimed to be allowed

to control it, and prevent its salutary influence from being rendered nugatory. Since Lord Thurlow's time it has always been usual so to protect the wife against her husband's cupidity and her own want of prudence.

There was yet another method by which the Court of Chancery was enabled to do justice at the expense of the law. We have seen that personalty became the actual property of the husband by the mere fact of marriage; but that, to chuses in action, a condition was affixed that they should be reduced into possession during coverture. Now, in order to effectuate this, it was sometimes necessary to invoke the aid of the Court; and, when that was the case, the Court refused its assistance, unless a suitable provision was made for the wife, which was called her equity to a settlement. This can only occur at the present time when the marriage took place before the 1st of January 1883, and the woman was entitled in possession before that date.

When marriage settlements became common, it was usual to insert a provision for the wife's dress and pocket-money, which was called pin-money. Though not unlike separate estate, it differs essentially from it. It could be recovered by action, and thereby became her property; but she had not the uncontrolled disposition of it, since she was obliged to expend it on her personal apparel, decoration, or ornaments.

We cannot pass from this period without briefly noticing the changes made in the law of divorce, more especially, as they affect the right of property. Under the Roman Law, as we have seen, marriage could be dissolved by a mere expressed desire; but this has at no time been the case in England. Before the Revolution, matrimonial causes were decided by the Church of Rome, through Ecclesiastical Courts established in this country. And although they granted a divorce *a mensa et thoro* (now called a judicial separation), or annulled the marriage *ab initio*, they refused to rescind the contract and permit the parties to marry again. Later, the Church recognized marriages after divorce *a mensa et thoro*, if it had been obtained for adultery. But, apart from the consequences that followed, there was no difficulty in obtaining annulment, provided the fees were duly paid. In fact, the pious founder of the Protestant faith in England, Henry VIII., annulled his marriage with Anne Boleyn on the grounds (1) that she had previously promised to marry a Northumberland; and (2) that he had himself had intercourse with her sister, and therefore came within the prohibited degrees of consanguinity. When the sentence of divorce *a mensa et thoro* was pronounced, it was necessary for the parties to enter into bond that they would not again marry during the life of the other. It was owing to this that, about 1666, the assistance of Parliament was invoked to sanction the marriage of

Lord Roos, in spite of his bond. And, since 1700, it has been common, though expensive, to apply to Parliament for a dissolution of marriage. In 1857 an Act to amend the law relating to divorce and matrimonial causes was passed; and it transferred all matters matrimonial from the Ecclesiastical Courts to the Court for Divorce and Matrimonial Causes. It renamed the old divorce *a mensa et thoro*, calling it judicial separation; and added two new grounds—viz., desertion for two years and cruelty. During judicial separation a wife was placed in the position of a *feme sole*, with regard to property acquired by her, and, also, for the purpose of contracting and suing; protection was afforded to the earnings of a woman whose husband had deserted her. Power was given to the Court to dissolve the marriage, without incurring the evil consequences of annulling it; the Court could make a settlement of the property to which she was entitled; and, by a later statute, property under settlement was, after dissolution, to be in the disposition of the Court.

It was not until 1870 that a married woman's separate property was directly recognized by Parliament; but, in that year, a Bill was passed through the Commons, which, if it had become law, would have placed a married woman in the position of a *feme sole*, with regard to property, as the Act of twelve years later has done. But the substance was rejected by the Lords, and the only effect it had was to deem certain classes of property separate estate of the wife; the principal being earnings subsequent to the passing of the Act, from a trade carried on independently of her husband; deposits in savings banks; and property to which she became entitled after the Act, as heiress or next of kin of an intestate, or, if not exceeding £200, under a deed or will. It also gave her power to sue, but not be sued, alone, for any separate property under the Act, or for property which her husband had agreed, before marriage, should be her separate property. In other cases the husband must be joined as a party. We have now arrived at the last stage of historical development. The Married Women's Property Act 1882, from January 1, 1883, entirely abrogates the old Common Law doctrine of unity between husband and wife, so far as property *inter se* is concerned.

Henceforth, they are to have separate and antagonistic interests; and the woman whom Mill portrayed as a degraded slave is emancipated by statute, with all the attributes and privileges of a freeman. She is made capable of acquiring, holding, and disposing of property as if she were a *feme sole*, and of contracting in respect of, and to the extent of, her separate property. If married after January 1, 1883, all property belonging to, acquired by, or devolving upon her, is to be separate estate; but, if she was married before that date, only if the title and possession accrues to her after that date; she is to have the same civil and criminal remedies for the protection of

her separate property as if she were a *feme sole*, though she may only prosecute her husband if he has wrongfully taken her property when leaving or deserting her; she is even liable to have to maintain her husband, children, or grandchildren. So far the end is obtained, and married women are at liberty to do what they like with their own, provided they are not restrained otherwise than by marriage. In particular instances, injustice may still follow when a woman has the misfortune to have been married before August 9, 1870, or even before January 1, 1882. But it is not the province of the Legislature to interfere with existing contracts under which rights have arisen; nor is it possible to frame a law that is applicable and fair to every conceivable case. The utmost that can be done is to legislate for the general welfare of the nation; and provided that is so, if an individual member of the community suffers he must console himself with the patriotic consideration that he is a martyr *pro bono publico*.

But the followers of the eminent logician and political economist referred to previously need by no means despair of finding scope for their energies. It is only with regard to property that matters have improved since the *Subjection of Women* was published in 1869.

An important enactment was, however, passed in 1886 to amend the law relating to the guardianship and custody of infants. On the death of the father, the mother is to be guardian, either alone or jointly, with any testamentary guardian appointed by the father, or with one appointed by the Court; she may appoint, either by deed or will, a guardian, who will be entitled to act, either from the death of both parents, alone or jointly with one appointed by the father, or from her own death jointly with the father, if such father is unfit to be the sole guardian. The Court has power to make orders as to the custody of, or access to, such infants; and to remove any testamentary guardian, or any guardian appointed or acting by virtue of the Act, and to appoint another guardian in the place of one so removed. Apart from this, the position and status are very much the same as it was in the olden days. There is still but one, and one only, head of every family in England; wives may still be forced to reside in the same house as their husbands, and to have their liberty restrained, if they insist upon leaving it; children are still left under the sole control and guardianship of a man whom their mother may think most unfit for the position; and lastly, the Legislature has not as yet seen fit to abrogate the promise made at the marriage ceremony that a woman will love, honour, and obey the man to whom she is about to place herself in subjection.

These questions, however, though interesting to social reformers, do not form part of the history of married women. What that history is we have seen something of, and it is worthy of notice that



this beneficial legislation has been brought about, not by the noisy agitation which we are told must precede any genuine reform, but through the influence of those who, after having given the subject their able and mature consideration, unbiassed either by interest or faction, were in a position to know what was the then existing law and to judge of the probable effect of the proposed change.

R. M. MINTON-SENIHOUSE.

## LEASEHOLD ENFRANCHISEMENT.

SOME adjustment of the relations between the landlord of the ground and the landlord of the house seems to be urgently required to prevent the present anomalous arrangement from entailing the sudden loss of property on the one side for the sudden benefit of the other.

Besides, it is undoubtedly to the advantage of the State as a whole that as many of its citizens as possible should have a direct and permanent interest in the soil.

If therefore some scheme can be formulated which would promote both these objects without injury to either proprietor, it would be one well worthy of serious consideration. But it is a fundamental condition that, whatever it is, it must be equitable to all parties, and introduce as few changes as possible in existing contracts and rights.

It is a question, too, already exciting deep attention, and the importance of which cannot be laid aside upon abstract principle, nor ignored because it is inconvenient. Is it really incapable of an equitable solution?

In this climate a minute subdivision of agricultural land, except as allotments or gardens, would probably result in failure and disappointment, but with regard to land covered with houses and already split practically into small fractions there would seem to be an opportunity for a high aim of true statesmanship to be achieved.

No advance in this direction seems possible, however, if those who are in favour of, and those who are against, what for convenience is called "Leasehold Enfranchisement," are to be strictly believed. On the one side it is claimed that the cessation of interest in leasehold property at the termination of the lease is "despoilment" by, and, on the other, the same operation is called "restitution" to, the landowner.

It is quite clear that the "despoilment" and the "restitution" theses must have some grounds to go upon. What are they? In the first case, the leaseholder has bound himself by covenants to give up the possession of the land with all he has built upon it, and usually to put the property into tenantable repair at the termination of the lease. He entered, or his forefather did, into

this contract with his eyes wide open and as a sane man. This must be assumed, and why then should the bargain be deemed unfair because it matures ninety-nine years or so after it was made? On the face of it the leaseholder appears to be seeking relief from the contract of which he has had undisputed benefit for no other reason than because the co-contractor is about to receive the reward of his patience. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the leaseholder when his lease terminates is deprived of property which he built or for which he paid. And the further fact, which rather aggravates his alleged "despoilment" is, that he has been paying ten, twenty, or perhaps fifty, times the agricultural value all along, and that his property has given greatly increased security at the same time that it has vastly augmented the rent-roll of the landowner.

In the second case, the landowner has parted with the use of his land, and alienated his rights for a long period, in order that it may be restored to him with an increased value and this is "restitution."

If no ground-rent had been charged the landowner's case would be all but absolutely unanswerable, and "restitution" would fairly represent the falling-in of the property at the expiration of the lease, but where ground-rent, at a valuation exceeding that of the use of the land in any other ordinary way, has been charged, an entirely new circumstance arises which makes the falling-in of the property seem altogether inequitable.

It has been, and it generally is, assumed in arguments on this subject that the leaseholder has fulfilled his covenants, and is therefore entitled to fair consideration at the end of his lease. On the other hand, it is stated that at the making of the contract the leaseholder received his consideration in being charged a lower ground-rent than he would have had to pay if the termination of the tenancy had not been allowed for; and further, as the leaseholder, knowing his limited tenure could at a very small annual outlay have provided for the recoupment of his expended capital at its termination, he in no way deserves either further consideration or commiseration. Even if this be true, it in no way goes to meet the case of the State that it is high policy to cause a larger number of citizens to be interested directly in the land itself. But is it true in the sense of being the whole truth?

Is it true that "a portion of the freeholder's interest is retained by the leaseholder every year until, by the end of the term, these sums have given the latter back the whole of his capital," as is stated on behalf of the "Property Defence League"? Is it true that "the freeholder provides the sinking fund to repay the leaseholder's capital," and is himself paid by the reversion, the whole operation being one of "mutual restoration." (Nothing, it will be noticed, is said of the leaseholder's having paid a largely increased rent to the landowner,

who might in like manner have recouped himself had he been required to give up the land to the leaseholder.) A practical view of the case will dispose of this very ingenious theory, which is in the highest degree commendable as an effort in the direction of "original research." It is only necessary to go back to the beginning of the transaction to see that the freeholder would not have suggested various alternative ground-rents, but would at once have struck his bargain at the highest figure he could obtain. It is a little too much, however, to claim belief in this hypothetical and touching picture displaying the freeholder generously foregoing some considerable present advantage for himself and for his posterity for two or three generations, in order that his very remote descendant might enter in and be rewarded. Is it not far more in keeping with a common-sense view of the transaction to conclude that in all probability the freeholder parted with the use of his property upon the best terms he could get, and superadded from the necessity of the leaseholder the covenant of dispossession?

Moreover, it must not be forgotten that in many, if not in most, cases the builder or leaseholder has not had the option of obtaining a longer lease than he accepted, and still less an option of obtaining the freehold. On the other hand, he was not absolutely compelled to make the contract; and, having made it freely, ought he not to abide by it? Is every one to begin to whine for help from the Jupiter of the State as soon as his cart-wheel gets into the ruts of his own making? Must it not be admitted, too, that it probably did answer the purpose of the first tenant to build, as he in most cases advantageously parted with his interest and liabilities, and that the current possessor made his purchase with full knowledge of the facts? Again, State policy and equity are unmet, but need they be subordinated to a claim practically extorted?

Here it seems to be necessary to recur to the well-established axiom that the ownership of land is subject to disabilities in regard to freedom of treatment by its owners which do not pertain to many other kinds of property. For example, though within their legal powers, would it be permitted that the great landlords of London should lay waste their properties even if they deliberately chose to do so? The interest of the vast body of their tenants, of the local authorities in regard to rates, and generally of the community, would be too strongly affected. It would become a matter for the State, and the State would interfere. So with regard to a general refusal to allow the user of land. In short, the strictly legal rights of the landowner are, and must be, always, subject to wider considerations. This is instanced in Parliamentary provisions for the acquisition for public purposes of the land belonging to individuals in spite of their opposition. If therefore it is, as alleged, a matter of high State policy that greater facilities than now exist should be created for the

acquisition and distribution of land, it is quite within the competence of Parliament to pass legislation in that direction. But whatever is done, there must always be the most careful preservation of all individual interests and a jealous regard to equity. Can it be said that the contracts made as to the letting of land for building purposes have fulfilled either of these conditions? Nevertheless, the substantial interest in the land must be preserved to the owner, and what is needed is the devising of some practical and workable plan which will place both freeholder and leaseholder in an equitable position.

At the present time there are glaring wrongs to be redressed, such as the forfeiture of a business, which the lessee has created by his own industry, to the owner of the land when the lease runs out. In such a case, situation is the most important factor, and as it is not possible for the owner of the business to transfer it to some other locality without the probability of the severest loss, he is forced into the position either of losing the fruit of his previous labours or of paying the very highest terms that may be asked for the extension of the lease. It is the rule, though there are exceptions, that human virtue is unable to resist the pleasure and advantage of squeezing inordinately a fellow-man, even if it should withstand the temptation of calmly walking into possession of his life-work in the strictest legal accordance with the terms of a practically forced contract made a hundred years or so before. And yet it may be fairly said that the dispossessee was fully aware of the position in which he was placed, and that if he chose to put his goods into another man's basket he alone is blameable for his imprudence. The defence is that the other man's basket was the only available space for this act of imprudent storage. In such a case as this typical one, is illustrated the working of the present system against which the suppositiously effective remedy of the laying by, each year of the lease, a sum sufficient to cover the loss at its expiry, is wholly inadequate, for the principal value *ex hypothesi* arises just prior to dispossession, is bound up with the site, cannot be computed beforehand, and therefore cannot be met by the laying-by system. No attempt is here made to dispute the legal right, but only to show cause for an alteration of the law on account of its inequity.

Another phase of the case has to do with restrictions of user, in regard to which, however, general regulations for a locality seem more likely to be for the general good than such as spring from the sole will and pleasure of the freeholder. On the other hand, failing the suggested general regulations, if each enfranchised leaseholder could do whatever he pleased with his own holding, he might, while well within his legal rights, inflict very severe damage upon his neighbours. The present system of big estates under a common ownership though minutely underlet, has been, and with great effect, justified, and even

recommended as the best possible, for this very reason, as the enactment of general and binding conditions has been assumed to be otherwise unattainable. But the passing of the Local Government Act, giving enlarged powers to local authorities, has brought this "unattainable" safeguard within the range of easy acquisition.

Before offering a suggestion which would perhaps, if adopted, meet the full equity of the case, as between the leaseholder and the freehold landowner at the end of the lease, it may be as well to notice that the key-note of every plan hitherto devised seems to be the fixture of a term of years' purchase of the ground-rent as a discharge of the landlord's claim, and the institution of Land Courts, or the adaptation of County or other Courts, as the authoritative judge of the exact term of years. But against this may be set the primary and fundamental objection that figures and not facts—the figures of a past generation, not the facts of the present time—are to be taken as the basis of discharge. Setting aside for the moment the landlord's view of this method, there are the peppercorn and the nominal ground-rents which could not be so dealt with, and would either involve a treatment outside of equity or outside of the general plan, so that the administrators of a leasehold enfranchisement scheme would be in a dilemma at the outset in dealing with a large number of cases.

Is it then impossible fairly to meet the demand of the State that more citizens must become owners of the soil, without the crudity of a fixed term for all cases? The position contended for is, that it is not equitable to dispossess the leaseholder at the end of his lease and to hand over his property to the owner of the ground; and that it would be equally inequitable to hand over the land to the leaseholder upon his payment of a certain number of years' purchase of a ground-rent fixed, when possibly, and in most cases certainly, the value of the land was immensely different. Let us at once dismiss the theory of a common reduction of ground-rent *ab initio* on account of the reversion; let us also dismiss the pleasing calculation showing by what a fractional yearly saving the leaseholder could have recouped himself for the loss of his property with the loss of his tenure. Let us not profanely urge that the same forbearance exercised by the landlord would in like manner have enabled him without loss to give up the land to the leaseholder. And, clear of these purely academic notions, which are the sweet delights of the ingenious, let us see whether the aims of the State and the equities of landlord and of leaseholder cannot be met.

Let it be taken as a fact that, both parties having to be dealt with, priority of option must be given to one of them, and that that one must be the leaseholder who has immovable property, houses or what not, on the landlord's ground.

The suggestion is that at the expiration of the lease, the ground

should be valued *as if it were vacant*, and that upon the basis of that new valuation the leaseholder should have the option of purchase. The advantage of this plan is, that it preserves the interests of the landlord while it also enables the leaseholder to preserve his own. It seems to afford the basis for an absolutely equitable adjustment of conflicting interests.

Further, if the leaseholder refused to continue in possession by purchase upon the new basis, that his property, houses or what not, upon the land, be valued, and then the landlord should have the right to purchase them at that valuation.

Should the leaseholder refuse to purchase the land and the landlord refuse to buy the buildings, both properties should be put up for public sale, and the net proceeds should be divided between the parties in the proportion of the two separate valuations at which each had refused to purchase.

As an example, let us suppose a leaseholder has a house at a ground-rent of £10 per annum, and his lease terminates in three months: a valuation is made and the ground is estimated to be of the increased capital value of £400. The leaseholder now acquires the right to purchase it at that figure; he refuses, and his house being valued at £600 the landlord acquires the right to purchase it for that sum; he refuses, and both properties are put up for public sale, at which neither party may bid, by himself or his agent. If the sale realizes £1000, the leaseholder goes away with his £600 and the landlord with his £400; but whether the properties fetch more or fetch less, the distribution of net proceeds must be in the proportion of the valuations originally arrived at, being in this case six-tenths and four-tenths, as the whole has been taken as worth £1000, and the parts at £600 and £400 respectively. The rights of mortgagees would not be affected, as they would in any case have a right to their full claims before transfer or completion of sale.

In cases where the leaseholder's property was practically worthless or worn out, there would not be any hardship to the landlord if the same plan were pursued as here suggested, as he would get the full value for his property, and if the leaseholder refused to purchase, the landowner would have nothing to pay for but perhaps some old materials. The great point is, that whatever the true value, in either case each party would have his own and no more.

This scheme would thus apply equitably all round, both where the present value of the ground was so great that the leaseholder did not care to buy it, and where the value of the leaseholder's property was either little or great.

Though in some cases, especially on large estates, leases are renewed at an increased ground-rent, such are matters of forbearance and arrangement, but not of right. The contention is that State policy demands that this important matter should be made a

legal, instead of being allowed to remain merely an equitable, right. And the suggestion here made appears to provide a just basis for the settlement of claims apparently so conflicting as to baffle the efforts of statesmen.

It will be noticed that the scheme suggested is absolutely dependent upon a just valuation being made. But how is this fundamental and equitable valuation to be arrived at? Is the State to interfere? Are new Land and House Valuation Courts to be everywhere established? As to State interference—No! always No! unless private endeavour is manifestly inadequate and a failure. And hence no Land Courts and the like.

It may be asked, how are other business transactions managed? By the State, or by the exercise of individual effort and the free use of individual experience? Would not the latter be a hundred times better?

It is therefore suggested that, as in other matters so in this, the parties concerned should arrive at agreement between themselves, by the use of experts, or still failing, by the decision of an arbitrator mutually chosen. And even if valuations varied, as decisions in Courts would vary and do vary, arrangements that both parties came to *bona fide* would call for no outside comment; and, besides, are there no variations in value now?

And further, the ordinary Courts would be open as they are now to all who possess the golden key, and who prefer to revel in the delights of being principals in litigation rather than to pass peaceably into a mutually beneficial settlement.

Another mode of settlement would be the renewal of the lease for a fresh term of years, upon the new basis of value, but the main point is the establishment of the principle of the non-forfeiture of property at the termination of a ground lease. And this, by the valuation of the ground *as if vacant*, seems to be possible with due regard to equity, and with the preservation of every just right.

It is, moreover, in accordance with the principle already recognized by statute, in the case of tenants of agricultural land—viz., that their interest in their irremovable improvements shall not be forfeited at the termination of their lease.

ARMYTAGE BAKEWELL.



## THE APPLE AND THE EGO OF WOMAN.

COUNTLESS papers on woman, deploring her limitations, general incapacity and glaring deficiencies, have now poured out for several years from the periodical press, besides numerous works throwing quite an electric light on her psychology, such as *Madame Gervaisais*, by MM. de Goncourt; the startlingly frank confessions of the young Russian artist, Marie Baschkirtseff; *Margaret Dunmore* and *Scientific Meliorism*, by Miss J. H. Clapperton; some of the essays in Mr. Karl Pearson's *Ethic of Free Thought*; *A South African Farm* and *Three Dreams in a Desert*, by Miss Olive Schreiner; *Dr. Breen's Practice*, by W. D. Howells; *Out of the World*, by Miss Thackeray; *Goneril*, by A. Mary F. Robinson (Mme. James Darmesteter); *Miss Stotford's Speciality*, by the late P. B. Marston; *Mrs. Lorimer*, by Lucas Malet, and various others. Thus we are all very well informed as to the Ego<sup>1</sup> of woman, as to its disabilities, whether moral, intellectual, physical, or political; its scanty record of celebrated names to place among the Immortals; its total unconsciousness of science; its emotional rather than intellectual treatment of crises; its ineradicable love of dress and shopping, of domesticity, society, and scenic effects; its insatiable desire of fixing other people's attention on it, and the consequent flare-out of æsthetic dadoisms and terra-cottaisms; its love of hospitals and sickness, and choosing of poultices as the path to fame; its Primrose League meetings and brooches, which combine politics and flummery; its Women's Liberal Associations, which quiver and quake at the granting of the Parliamentary franchise to women; its "flowers without foliage," to wit, High School mistresses, who have uncocooned themselves from the family and yet cut themselves off from men's society, thereby displaying feminine traits with the intensity of isolation; its philanthropy, producing women on School Boards and Boards of Guardians of the poor; who always "manage" "convalescent," "preventive," and other "Homes," but not the paternal or marital home.

We have been informed of all the salient features budding out of this Ego, and we think we can afford to alternately smile at or condole with its weaknesses and inefficiencies, its powerlessnesses and

<sup>1</sup> By this expression we wish to draw attention to woman's *psychology* rather than to her *physiology*; the latter having been already copiously dealt with.

Also, as it is a moot point whether there is sex in mind or not, we wish to use a neuter gender.

improductivities, its puny futile actions, and general ineffectualnesses.

Some twenty-three years ago, we all remember to have heard a good deal about leaps in the dark, and educating our masters; it now does not seem to strike mankind that it behoves them to educate their *mistress*, the Ego of woman, looming pretty distinctly now on the horizon.

Those who occupy themselves with reading writing on the wall, will be the first to be made aware of the serious state of things—very serious indeed to *them* especially. Like the fisherman who so heedlessly liberated the Genius, which promptly rewarded him by proposing to annihilate him, so will it fare with the modern emancipators. The Ego of woman is a mighty genius to unbotle, and the acrid smoke of its ascent may disintegrate many precious super-organic structures.

There is a very strong impression abroad that this Ego is a timid, long-suffering, and sweetly altruistic spirit, with limited brain-power indeed, but with limitless sympathies. It has suffered much from the tyranny of man, and so much repression must necessarily have made it weak and harmless. Little do the large body of persons who judge thus heed the awful dictum of science—"Matter restrained from the fulfilment of any of its natural tendencies affords power; the removal of the restraining force permitting the play of the tendencies so controlled produces action."

This dictum is endorsed by literature—"Le génie silencieux des masses collectives est la source de toutes les grandes choses." But the tyranny of man is not so great as has been supposed, and has consisted for the most part in prosaically following the tyranny of nature, and insisting on every woman being a wife or mother. Carlyle saw the point at which degradation steps in, and wrote in his journal, 1851: "It is man's part to deal with destiny, who is *known* to be inexorable. It is the woman's more to deal with the man, whom, even in impossible cases, she always thinks capable of being moved by human means, in this respect a harder, at least a less dignified lot."

But what never seems to have crossed Carlyle's mind, is that the state of things which he described, instead of being an everlasting fiat of creation, and a fine example of eternal justice, was simply an artificial and arbitrary state which *could* and *would* be put an end to.

The Ego of woman is giving up the tortuous zigzags of cajolery. Just now, it does *not* feel inclined to obey the poet:

"Marchez dans la route tracée,  
Aimez. N'enviez pas à d'autres leur pensée;  
Il faut se contenter des lumières qu'on a;  
L'un est plus sage et l'autre est plus doux; Dieu donna  
Plus de fruit au figuier, plus d'ombre au sycomore."

It does *not* sigh for only room to deny itself. It much prefers a room to study in. It no longer feels satisfied, for instance, at passing such a day as that described in the cheerful quailmless Lenten diary of Miss Susannah Darwin, who lived in the cheerful pre-Darwinian times of the eighteenth century (1748):—"Rose before seven, eat a pear; breakfast at a quarter-past eight, fed ye cats, went to church; at one, pease porrage, puddin, bread and cheese; fore, Mrs. Chappells came; five, drank tea; six, eat half an apple; seven, a porreng of boyld milk, read in ye *Tutler*; at eight, a glass of punch, filled up ye vacancies of the day with work as before."

The Ego now prefers a day without vacancies, and this is the noticeable point—it is capable of getting what it prefers—viz., sitting on County Councils, School Boards and others; canvassing and addressing electors; writing theses on vivisection and such; acting Greek plays; lecturing on Greek art; sailing round the world in steam yachts; climbing untrodden paths and unfrequented passes; founding societies, guilds, missions, leagues, unions, associations innumerable, for the improvement and perfecting of mankind;<sup>1</sup> with objects of great variety, as recommending "whole meal bread" up to "bringing beauty home to the people."

The Ego who requires money is acting as<sup>2</sup> doctor, dentist, chemist, house decorator, florist, plan-tracer, wood-carver, librarian, landscape-gardener, wood-engraver, dispenser, stockbroker, conveyancer, accountant, auditor, shorthand writer, reporter, painter, type-writer, chrono-lithographer, photographer, telephonist, telegraphist, clerk, bookkeeper, stained-glass designer, &c. Abroad the Ego is<sup>3</sup> journalist, lawyer, mayor, captain of a steamer, coachman, vine-grafter, inventor of armour plates to men-of-war, inventor of life-boats and cannons of new patterns, of steam whistles ditto; of an indiarubber material (Woodite) applied as a protective covering to vessels; of an apparatus for destroying vegetation on railroads,<sup>4</sup> &c. The Ego is Unitarian minister, and ordained Methodist and ordained Universalist, &c. Though women are carefully kept subservient in the Church of England, it is remarkable that an Ego's recent novel, turning on the cardinal doctrine of Christianity, has generally taken the place in the public mind which *Eccle Homo* took in 1866. This is a change somewhat since fifty years ago, when in 1838 the then Bishop of London forbade ladies to go to Wheatstone's lectures on electricity. For what reason? Because they had congregated to hear Lyell! This ecclesiastic, if he had had to translate into Latin prose "Ought women to learn the alphabet?" would doubtless have begun his version with a "num."

<sup>1</sup> The wish to perfect mankind before perfecting itself is the Ego's weakest point.

<sup>2</sup> *Englishwoman's Year Book* for 1888.

<sup>3</sup> *La Citoyenne*, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Out of 2500 patents granted to women by the United States Government, none reveal a new principle.—*Times*, Dec. 1882.

The Established Church has ever shown singular jealousy and contempt of women, whereas the Protestant Nonconformist bodies and the Romish Church have treated them with marked liberality. This is the reason why earnest women of the servant class turn to Dissent, and saintlike women of the upper classes born in the Anglican persuasion often pass into the Catholic faith—witness, Miss Mary Stanley, Lady Georgiana Fullerton, and others. Inveterate jealousies take place usually between aspirants who only differ *slightly* from each other. The Ego of woman has always done informally what it is the parson's business to do formally, and therefore it would be ready to take his place at any moment. There never was a time since history began when the Ego was unphilanthropic, or without that large maternal heart which gathers up the waifs and strays: the weak, the sat-upon, the broken-down, the friendless, the outcast and the dying. In fact, its magnificent emotional powers, capsuled during past æons and mercilessly chained to the cloister or the hearth, in these latter days parched in that Gobi of thought, a modern drawing-room—will yet roll over the world in fructifying waves, causing also incalculable upheaval and destruction. The stirrings and rumblings now perceivable in the social and industrial worlds, the "Bitter-Cries" of the disinherited classes, the "Social Wreckage" which is becoming able to make itself unpleasantly prominent, the "Problems of Great Cities," the spread of Socialism and Nihilism, are all intimately connected with the ascent of the Ego. Why this remorse, this searching of heart in the classes at the terrible privations of the masses? Why the shocking revelations of immorality undertaken at the risk of imprisonment? Fifty years ago the upper classes felt quite conscience-whole, and were fully persuaded that "things went very well then;" with no Elementary Education Act, People's Palace, Trained Nurses for the Poor, Kyrle Society, Girls' Friendly Society, &c. This comparative tenderness of conscience now apparent in our legislators and rulers is produced—without their knowing it, of course—by the immensely increased influence of the Ego of woman. Now tenderness of conscience in the ruler produces restlessness of the ruled. For the reason why complaints are not generally uttered, is simply because it is *hopeless to get a hearing for them*, not because there are no complaints to utter. The friend of the nervous person, who thinks that the latter's nerves are so much improved because after a snubbing he no longer confides his troubles to his friend, is vastly mistaken.

Mr. Romanés is kind enough to say of the Ego, "Give her the apple, and see what comes of it." He also amiably reassures his countrymen that in his "opinion the days are past when any enlightened man ought seriously to suppose that in now again reaching forth her hand to eat of the tree of knowledge woman is

preparing for the human race a second Fall." This confidence is satisfactory, nevertheless Mr. Romanes underrated the enormous power acquired by the Ego's possession of the grand habit of doing-without; also the force of its numerical preponderance in the strongest part of the body politic, the middle class. But *why* the Ego appears so harmless is because instead of having taken time by the forelock, it has—to use Mrs. Carlyle's words—taken it by the pigtail. Its youthful years of acquirement have too often been an "Apathy, tempered by emanations of the Minerva Press." It has never had adequate power of expression, and things which are not expressed are apt to be altogether unknown. For long generations the Ego has had no history, except when mentioned as a genealogical link:

"A link among the days, to knit  
The generations each with each."

M. Véra tells us why in his sentence, "*La Nature, ne pense pas; voilà pourquoi elle n'a pas d'histoire.*" In the excessive dimness of the remote past we just catch a glimpse of the existence of a matriarchate. In Accad<sup>1</sup> the Ego occupied a higher position than among the Semites who have had so much to do with moulding our civilization. The position of the Ego has always been greatly modified by race instincts: witness England and Germany at the present time. The three nations which have led thought, the Jewish, Greek, and Roman, have been all distinctly unfavourable to it, especially the Jewish. Owing to the decline of the authority of the ancients caused by the rise of modern science, the Ego is now coming to the front, and the anathemas of all societies for the protection of ancient attitudes of thought are powerless to backen it in its present vigorous state, "unfettered by the consciousness of superiority."

What the Ego is weakest in is plastic power, used in its widest sense. Authors innumerable have noted this, especially those who have worked on the art-for-art principle. As Gustave Flaubert says, women have no disinterested love of the Beautiful; they will write to satisfy a craving, but not to satisfy any attraction to art. Consequently they rarely have style of any kind. One very obvious reason of the Ego's deficiency in this matter is, that it is so early initiated into the primary personalities of material

<sup>1</sup> "Among the Accadians . . . it was the mother, and not the father, who stood at the head of the family; and in the bi-lingual texts we find that in the Accadian original the female is always mentioned before the male, while the Semitic translator is careful to reverse the order" (Sayce, Hibbert Lectures, 1887). A writer in the *Women's Penny Paper*, December 1, 1888, notices something of the same spirit of detraction shown by the English translators of Psalm xlviii. 11: "The Lord gave the word, great was the company of those that published it;" which in the revised version is now rendered, "The Lord giveth the word: the women that publish the tidings are a great host."

existence, that the *mere simulacra* of life through the medium of print feel shadowy and unreal to it. Owing to ancestral habit the Ego feels impregnable while dandling a baby or darning a stocking, though if found studying a subject remote from daily life (say, Cosmothetic Idealism) it would instantly begin to apologize. Instinctively it feels that poetry is still entwined round the old-world occupations: .

“ La femme file, trait la vache, tait le bonnet,  
Tourne le sablier quand vient le fin de l'heure,  
Gronde l'esclave aux champs et l'enfant dans son jeu,  
Veille et travaille; . . . ”

The Ego has a righteous horror of destroying any pictorial position it may yet retain in the mind of man. It quite understands the piquancy of an intelligent ignorance, and the danger of exciting disgust by a display of accurate knowledge. M. Jules Lemaitre, in a suggestive paper referring to Madame Alphonse Daudet's *L'enfance d'une Parisienne*, gives an ingenious reason for the prosaic amble of the Ego's style (like the tramp of a girls' private school). He thinks that, owing to its predominance of sentiment, it has no power of vivid portraiture. Instead of painting the actual facts, as they occur in the *first* moment of perception, the Ego prefers the *last* moment, thereby dragging in a superfluous analysis and various sentiments evoked by the perception. These destroy the liveliness and picturesqueness of the phrases.

Every one must have noticed that this tendency to enlarge the commentary at the expense of the text is very characteristic of the Ego, and constitutes the “preachy” element which is so peculiarly abhorrent to the artistic temperament. Nevertheless, with the curious paradox which clings to everything connected with the Ego, M. Lemaitre's example of the picturesque in style is taken, most inconsistently, from a woman's writing (Madame de Sévigné's).

Of the two most precious unrealities in the world, Love and Thought, the Ego has been content with the former rather than with the latter.

The virtue it has least cultivated is what the Chinese call “Fasting of the Heart.”

The Ego has been regardless of the saying, “Les forts sont ceux qui n'aiment pas.”

It has relied too much on the unearned increment of beauty. It has been too heartily in accord with the young Frenchman in *Hand and Soul*, “Je tiens que quand on ne comprend pas une chose, c'est qu'elle ne signifie rien.”

It has endorsed too readily the ancient “*sequo animo nescire velle*.”

It has been content to make a pretty picture merely, like the

shepherd carrying home the lamb, which, as Mr. Stevenson sagaciously adds, he is only carrying home for dinner.

The *uacores selectissima* of Sir Thomas More have not yet stepped out of their native land of Utopia, though terribly wanted to overthrow the abuses of public schools. In these latter days their representatives have wasted too much time on the *stichomuthia* of afternoon tea.

The Ego's defects are morbidly exaggerated by the philosopher Schopenhauer.<sup>1</sup> The reason of his hatred of it is plain, namely, because it has never yet been a "pure knowing being," devoid of all personal aims, but has always been the property of another. This is the real tap-root of its lack of genius. Never yet has the Ego sat a sufficiently long time "naked on contemplation's mat" to get original ideas, or even to clasp the "sacred talisman of language." The probable turn which the Ego's unswathed intellect and powers will take in the world is an interesting subject for speculation. One does not require to be much of a prophet to agree with M. Anatole France that "*ce n'est qu'avec le passé qu'on fait l'avenir.*" The Ego's past has emphasized certain sides of life—in the good, the fostering, shielding, solicitous, concerned, earnest side; in the bad, the sensuous, frivolous, vain, grabbing, self-centred, jealous side. Victor Hugo, in an eloquent speech in his curious book, *La Fin de Satan*, describes a trait of the Divine Essence in terms which recall very much the Ego of woman. Especially in the line :

"Et sa tendresse égale un ver au séraphin."

"And His tenderness puts a worm and a seraph on an equality."

It is a brutal fact, unfortunately, that worms are many and seraphs few. The tendency of the Ego to relieve all alike from the consequences of their misdeeds, and to preserve the worst, and to enable the worst to freely propagate their kind is, even now, the great flaw of its philanthropy, and is raising up infinite difficulties for posterity.

Another peculiarity may be gleaned from women's novels. A very favourite situation with them is a heroine with two lovers—one a showy scamp, the other a devoted but not brilliant character. The heroine invariably gives her affection to the scamp, and is not at all looked down upon for her folly, but much rather sympathized with by the author. We fear that scamps will for a long time possess increasing attraction for the Ego, because they afford good material for the exercise of its powers of reforming and influencing, and also nourish its largely-developed instincts of solicitude.

<sup>1</sup> It is noticeable that life-long companionship of women has been particularly abhorred by metaphysicians of genius, witness Plato, Descartes, Spinoza, Hobbes, Hume, Kant, Schopenhauer, and others.

The Ego's first appearance in public life in sufficient preponderance to be a power worth reckoning with, will also be an occasion for an exhibition of that want of *esprit de corps* which even now is too prominent to be hid. Women's inferior privileges and position are quite as much caused by their bringing up of mingled isolation from kindred spirits and forced gregarious association in families, whether congenial to them or not, as by any tyranny of man. Till the Ego gets possession of silence and solitude, liberty and locomotion, its area of work will never be of the first importance.

But the Ego will doubtless free itself by degrees from its jealousy, and also from another weakness of a very hindering character—viz., that of feeling too annoyed at the swine's rejection of its pearls. This is a frequent cause of failure in the life of a clever woman. She is so accustomed to a beau ideal of recognition and support from her relations,<sup>1</sup> and to live in a kind of Mutual Admiration Society, where each member salaams her head to the other like the waving corn, that when her aims and ideas run counter to those of her family, and therefore cannot receive its approval, she is very apt to yield, and get discouraged for want of sympathy; often before there has been sufficient time for her aims and ideals to have been crowned with success—a kind of billsticking every illiterate can read. Then, as is well known, the persecutors and the snubbers are the first to offer congratulations and I-thought-so's. Of how many hundreds may it be said, and especially of women, "If the fool would but persevere in her folly, she would be counted wise."

We should be struck dumb with astonishment—if we were not blinded by the "film of familiarity"—at the marvellous way in which well-to-do mothers, having undergone the pain, discomfort, and danger of producing the child—no substitute for this part having yet been found by the ingenuity of man—throw away their arrows, and hand over their most powerful function to the nurse, governess, and schoolmaster; think much more of the size of the eyes than of the size of the brain of their offspring; chancing altogether the most dangerous part of the moral character in their boys; expecting, on a mere supply of cash, a finished and flawless article to be supplied them. This Aladdin's lamp, which has hardly yet been rubbed by the educated mother, is waiting for all those who shall display the energy to grasp it.

Nevertheless, we do not mean to imply that the Ego will become so much happier than at present. The disinherited classes enjoy themselves so magnificently whenever their shackles are momentarily loosened, and such very minute things give them pleasure, while the

<sup>1</sup> It is remarkable that the three most distinguished literary Englishwomen of the age—George Eliot, Charlotte Brontë, and Mrs. Barrett Browning—all lost their mothers in legal infancy, and all married late in life.



educated man or woman's insatiability and blaséness are so sadly patent to the meanest capacity, that it is hard to prophesy whether the opening up of new paths, combined with the closing up from behind of old ones, will increase the total sum of enjoyment.<sup>1</sup> Under no new régime can more lovely types be evolved than the best specimens of the old order, such as the wife of Sir Henry Lawrence, Mdle. Henriette Renan, Dorothy Wordsworth, Mrs. Catharine Tait, Mrs. Barrett Browning, Eugénie de Guérin, Mrs. Juliana H. Ewing, Lady Duff Gordon, all, let it be noticed, born in the intellectual purple; for the Ego as yet can only take advantage of its advantages, not of its disadvantages. When we think of these ladies we are inclined to fancy that a system which produced such characters cannot be faulty. However, we really have no choice. It does not rest with mere individuals to stop the world from spinning down the ringing grooves of change, especially in the present highly organized condition of the super-organic structures of the human mind. The world *has* decided that the Ego shall have the apple; perhaps the world cannot foresee the changes which its liberality will bring about.

Especially hidden is the Ego's destroying power. So accustomed are we to consider the feminine element as the conservative, fruitful, passive side of nature, that we never connect the idea of destruction with it, forgetful of the ever-truthful saying, "*On ne détruit que ce qu'on remplace.*"

If men pull women up to their intellectual life<sup>2</sup> all will be well, but what if women pull men instead down to theirs? This latter case is quite as likely to happen as the former. It *has* happened where the average Ego has been allowed full scope—namely, in society, which is levelled down to the meanest capacity of the most recently finished boarding-school Miss, and often degraded into a mere "Heirathsbureau."

In modern times the tyranny of the weak is even greater than the tyranny of the strong. Prophecy is unreliable as to the future of the human race, but it is not impossible that the Ego, with its cooped-up, unwasted energy of millions of generations, will find out a method of annihilating all movements displeasing to itself, as a kind of instinctive poetical requital for having been during all those past millions of generations—to use a colloquialism—"Out of it."

<sup>1</sup> The matron at a girls' industrial school heard the girls stirring and talking in the night, about 2 A.M. (they were to go to a treat at a lady's house the next day). On the matron's inquiry as to the noise, one of the girls answered, "Oh, please mistress, we can't go to sleep for thinking of the thin bread'n butter!"

<sup>2</sup> The expression "intellectual life" is here used as defined by Mr. Belfort Bax, as "more or less an effort to break away from immediate appearances and immediate interests."

## MR. BRYCE'S AMERICAN COMMONWEALTH

THE member for Aberdeen, and Regius Professor of Civil Law, is one of those of whom it may, with the greatest truth, be said that while their appearances as authors have been comparatively few, yet all that they have written is of the highest quality.

Mr. Bryce's work on the Holy Roman Empire was, in its original form, merely a University prize composition, and even with subsequent additions and improvements, it still remains a single volume of moderate size, and yet it was enough, as Mr. Freeman has said, to place its author at once in the first rank of historians. But invaluable and interesting as were the pages in which Mr. Bryce, for the first time, clearly explained to ordinary English readers the true nature of the mediæval empire, yet of even greater importance, and appealing to a far wider audience, are the three elaborate volumes he has now devoted to the great English-speaking Republic beyond the Atlantic. It may, without fear of contradiction, be affirmed that no equally accurate and elaborate work on the same subject has appeared in this, or, indeed, in any country before, and it will, no doubt, long retain its position as a standard authority. The book, too, is one in which the abundance and preciseness of the information are fully equalled by the interesting manner in which the details are related.

We need hardly say, when we are dealing with a writer of the stamp of Mr. Bryce, that his volumes are the result of long and arduous study. He had made several visits to the United States before he set himself to write about them, and he has been careful to allow his first impressions to be modified by subsequent knowledge, as the following passage from his introductory chapter will show :—

"When I first visited America, eighteen years ago, I brought home a swarm of bold generalizations. Half of them were thrown overboard after a second visit in 1881. Of the half that remained, some were dropped into the Atlantic when I returned across it after a third visit in

<sup>1</sup> *The American Commonwealth.* By James Bryce, M.P., D.C.L., Regius Professor of Civil Law in the University of Oxford, Author of *The Roman Empire*. Part I., The National Government; Part II., The State Government; Part III., The Party System; Part IV., Public Opinion; Part V., Illustrations and Reflections; Part VI., Social Institutions. Macmillan & Co., Bedford Street, W.C.

and although the two later journeys gave birth to some new views, these views are fewer and more discreetly cautious than their departed sisters of 1870. I can honestly say that I shall be far better pleased if readers of a philosophic turn find in the book matter from which they can safely build theories for themselves than if they take from it theories ready made."

It would be well if all writers were possessed of the same openness of mind and readiness to receive new truths as are here displayed. Mr. Bryce's first volume is entitled "The National Government," and after a brief sketch of its origin, he passes on to consider the various departments of the administration in detail. Naturally he commences his survey with the office of the President as head of the executive power.

The large amount of authority enjoyed by the American chief magistrate has often been remarked on as something unusual in a commonwealth organized on so democratic a basis. Few similar instances can be furnished from the history of ancient or modern times. At Athens, and in most of the other Greek democracies, no magistrate had anything like the power of the President, nor was the case different at Florence or the other Republics of mediæval Italy as long as they were really free. The Roman consul had, no doubt, even a wider extent of authority; but then its duration was only one year instead of four, and Rome never could be called a democratic State. The only parallel which comes at all near is the case of the general of the Achaian League, whose position, as Mr. Freeman has pointed out, and as Mr. Bryce also notices, was not unlike that of the American President; but here again the term of office only lasted for a single year.

To the question, Why then did the framers of the Federal constitution confer such large powers on the head of the State? Mr. Bryce answers as follows, no doubt correctly :—

"The explanation is to be found not so much in the wish to reproduce the British constitution as in the familiarity of the Americans as citizens of the several States with the office of State governor (in some States called president), and in their disgust with the feebleness which Congress had shown in its conduct of the war, and, after peace was concluded, of the general business of the country. Opinion called for a man because an assembly had been found to lack promptitude and vigour. And it may be conjectured that the alarms felt as to the danger from one man's predominance were largely allayed by the presence of George Washington. The creation of the office would seem justified by the existence of a person exactly fitted for it, one whose established influence and ripe judgment would repair the faults then supposed to be characteristic of democracy, its impulsiveness, its want of respect for authority, its incapacity for consistent policy."

Our author next proceeds to consider the mode of electing the President, and as this is the point in the American constitution where theory and practice have come to diverge most widely, and as

the ideas of ordinary English readers on the subject are rather confused, as they could hardly fail to be in those who derive their information on American affairs merely from the columns of the daily papers, it will be worth while to make the matter clear by a somewhat lengthy extract:—

“The constitution directs each State to choose a number of presidential electors equal to the number of its representatives in both Houses of Congress. Some weeks later, these electors meet in each State on a day fixed by law, and give their votes in writing for the President and Vice-President. The votes are transmitted sealed up to the capital, and there opened by the president of the Senate in the presence of both Houses and counted. This plan was expected to secure the choice by the best citizens of each State, in a tranquil and deliberate way, of the man whom they in their unfettered discretion should deem fittest to be chief magistrate of the Union. Being themselves chosen electors on account of their personal merits, they would be better qualified than the masses to select an able and honourable man for President. . . . No part of their scheme seems to have been regarded by the constitution-makers of 1787 with more complacency than this, although no part had caused them so much perplexity. No part has so utterly belied their expectations. The presidential electors have become a mere cog-wheel in the machine; a mere contrivance for giving effect to the decision of the people. Their personal qualifications are a matter of indifference. They have no discretion, but are chosen under a pledge to vote for a particular candidate. In choosing them the people virtually choose the President, and thus the very thing which the men of 1787 sought to prevent has happened—the President is chosen by popular vote.”

Mr. Bryce goes on to explain historically how this result came about, and indeed, it seems almost inevitable in a country where strongly-marked parties exist, that the contest for the chief magistracy should become simply a struggle between the nominees on each side. And it is vain to expect that the interposition between the candidates and the nation of an intermediate body, whose functions are confined to the election of the President, will make any substantial difference. The electors will invariably, as in the American case, become mere men of straw.

And whether the direct or indirect election of the head of the State be considered most desirable, it is quite evident that a system like this combines the disadvantages of both methods without having any advantages of its own.

The effect of it is that there is practically an interregnum of several months after the presidential election, for though what is called by this name is in theory only the choice of the electoral college, yet everyone knows whom the electors from each State will vote for. Thus the new President is in reality chosen in November, though he does not come into office till March, and during the interval his predecessor, whose term will so soon expire, is likely to exercise but little authority. Another result of this mode of election is, that as all the electors from each State, being chosen on the strict

party ticket, will cast their votes for the same man, the candidate who is elected may not have received a majority of the votes of the nation, supposing that he has carried many States by small majorities, while his opponent has secured larger majorities in a smaller number of States.

Mr. Bryce passes on to consider the rights and duties of the President. In a few words, he has the command of the army and navy, the duty of receiving foreign ambassadors, the right of commissioning ambassadors abroad, of making treaties, and of appointing all the higher Federal officers. These three latter functions, however, are executed with the advice and consent of the Senate, and as we know, from the recent instance of the Fisheries treaty, that consent is not always given when the majority of its members happen to belong to the party opposed to the President.

The position of the American chief magistrate is, however, much more independent of the legislature than that of an English Prime Minister. He cannot be removed from office before the expiration of his legal term, except by the process of impeachment, which must be based on some definite legal charge; and a sentence of deposition, to be valid, must have a majority of two-thirds of the Senate in its favour. And as a matter of fact, this extreme measure has only once been resorted to, and then without success. No amount of votes disapproving his policy at all affects the President's position. He has, too, a right of veto on all Bills passed by Congress, though they can be passed in spite of him by a two-thirds majority of both Houses, which, however, is not very often secured.

In fact, the President is not so much a chief minister as an elective king, chosen for a limited period. He is not himself a member of Congress, and only communicates with it by written message like a royal speech. His cabinet bears little analogy to the body which we know by that name in England. Its members are merely the subordinates of the President, and, like him, they cannot be members of the legislature, and cannot be removed from office by it, being answerable only to their head. In one of the most interesting chapters of this portion of his work, Mr. Bryce discusses the question, "Why great men are not chosen Presidents?" As he puts it—

"How it happens that this great office, the greatest in the world, unless we except the Papacy, to which any man can rise by his own merits, is not more frequently filled by great and striking men? In America, which is, beyond all other countries, the country of a 'career open to talents,' a country, moreover, in which political life is unusually keen, and political ambition widely diffused, it might be expected that the highest place would always be won by a man of brilliant gifts. But since the heroes of the revolution died out with Jefferson and Adams and Madison, some sixty years ago, no person except General Grant has reached the chair whose name would have been remembered had he not been President, and no President except Lincoln has displayed rare or striking qualities in the chair."

The reasons by which this state of things is explained are too long to reproduce in detail, but the words in which the discussion is summed up, may be quoted:—"Great men are not chosen Presidents, first, because great men are rare in politics; secondly, because the mode of choice does not bring them to the top; thirdly, because they are not in quiet times absolutely needed."

From the chief of the executive, our author naturally passes to deal with the two branches of the legislature, and first he treats of what is both, in fact and name, the Upper House, the American Senate. This body is the only really strong second chamber in the world, and though both American and English writers are apt to exaggerate its superiority to the House of Representatives, it unquestionably exists. A sufficient proof of this is afforded by the fact that a seat in the Senate is the goal of all the most ambitious members of the Lower House, while the time has long passed in England when it could be said that the men of greatest distinction in the Commons were looking forward to promotion to the House of Lords as the prize of their career.

There are several reasons on the surface of things for the higher position of the Senate. Its members are chosen for six years, while those of the House of Representatives sit only for two; they are much more often re-elected, and further, while neither House can, like the English House of Commons, compel the executive to pursue the policy it desires on pain of dismissal, yet the Senate has this power over the President, that many of his official acts require its confirmation, but do not need the sanction of the other House. But the real origin of the superior dignity of the American Upper Chamber must be found in the fact that it really represents a principle older than the Union itself: the separate sovereignty of the States. Even Mr. Bryce, admirable as is his exposition of the functions of the Federal Legislature, perhaps hardly brings out with sufficient emphasis the point often insisted on by Mr. Freeman, that in a perfect federation it is absolutely necessary to have a chamber representing the States as independent commonwealths, as well as one representing the nation as a whole. If he had quite grasped this idea he would not have considered it an objection against the constitution of the Senate that each State, large and small, had the same number of representatives in it. New York, with its 5,000,000, having only two senators, like Nevada, with its 40,000. Such an arrangement, is indeed absolutely required by the principle of State equality.

The senators from each State are elected by the local legislatures, and as has been already said, for a term of six years. The House of Representatives represents the nation on the basis of population, and its members are chosen for two years, by the system of *scrutin d'arrondissement*, or single member districts, the ratio of representatives

to population being 1 to 150,000. The division of each State into electoral districts is made by the State Legislature, and the following extract will explain the origin of a term which has become familiar in England of late:—

"These districts are now equal, or nearly equal in size, but in laying them out there is ample scope for the process called 'gerrymandering,' which the dominant party in a State rarely fails to apply for its own advantage. This process is so-called from Ellbridge Gerry, a leading democratic politician in Massachusetts, who, when Massachusetts was being re-distributed, contrived a scheme which gave one of the districts a shape like that of a lizard. A noted artist, entering the room of an editor who had a map of the new districts hanging on the wall over his desk, observed, 'Why, this district looks like a salamander,' and put in the claws and eyes of the creature with his pencil. 'Say rather a Gerrymander,' said the editor, and the name stuck. The aim of gerrymandering of course is so to lay out the one-membered districts as to secure in the greatest possible number of them a majority for the party which conducts the operation. This is done sometimes by throwing the greatest possible number of hostile votes into a district which is anyhow certain to be hostile, sometimes by adding to a district where parties are equally divided, some place in which the majority of friendly votes is sufficient to turn the scale. There is a district in Mississippi called the shoe-string district, 500 miles long by 40 broad, and another in Pennsylvania resembling a dumb-bell; and in Missouri a district has been contrived larger, if measured along its windings, than the State itself, into which as large a number as possible of negro votes have been thrown."

The House of Representatives is a very different body from the English House of Commons, with which an Englishman will naturally be led to compare it. The absence of Ministers involves also the absence of regular party leaders and whips, though party spirit is quite as keen as in the English Parliament. The person whose position corresponds most closely to that of a recognized party chief is, strange as it will appear to English readers, the Speaker of the House. He is always chosen by the party which has the majority, and is not expected, like the same functionary in England, to be absolutely impartial, but only not to favour his own side too much. The following quotation will illustrate the rather peculiar position occupied by this official:—

"In America, the Speaker has immense political power, and is permitted, nay, expected, to use it in the interests of his own party. In calling upon members to speak, he prefers those of his own side. He decides in their favour such points of order as are not distinctly covered by the rules. Although he does not figure in party debates in the House, he may and does advise the other leaders of his party privately, and when they 'go into caucus' (*i.e.*, hold a party meeting to determine their action on some pending question) he is present and gives counsel. He is usually the most eminent member of the party who has a seat in the House, and is really, so far as the confidential direction of its policy goes, almost its leader. . . . Although expected to serve his party in all possible directions, he must not resort to all possible means. Both in the conduct of debates and in the formation of committees, a certain amount of fairness to opponents is

expected of him. He must not palpably invert the rules of the House to their disadvantage, though he may decide all doubtful points against them. He must give them a reasonable share of 'the floor' (i.e., of debate). He must concede to them proper representation on committees. To define his duties on these points is impossible; yet everybody knows what they have been neglected, as was the case with a recent Speaker, whom I heard universally condemned because he had usually 'recognized' (i.e., called on in debate) his own friends only, and had otherwise crossed the line which custom had drawn between ordinary and oppressive partisanship."

The rules of procedure in the American House differ considerably from those in use in England, and provide for a much more stringent form of closure. Oratory is not much cultivated, but Mr. Bryce does not consider the average members of the House of Representatives at all inferior in practical capacity to those of the English Parliament. He thus sums up his comparison of the two assemblies:—

"True it is that great lights such as usually adorn the British Chamber are absent. True also that there are fewer men who have received a high education which has developed their taste and enlarged their horizons. The want of such men depresses the average. It is raised, however, by the almost total absence of two classes, hitherto well represented in the British Parliament—the rich dull parvenu who has bought himself into public life, and the perhaps equally unlettered young sporting or fashionable man, who neither knowing or caring anything about politics, has come in for a county or (before 1885) for a small borough on the strength of his family estates. Few congressmen sink to so low an intellectual level as these two sets of persons, for congressmen have almost certainly made their way by energy and smartness, picking up a knowledge of men and things all the time."

After describing the details of congressional finance and legislation, Mr. Bryce gives a general view of the relations between the legislature and the executive powers in America, as compared especially with England. It is obvious that the harmony between the two is likely to be much less complete in the former country, since the President may belong to a different party from the majority in both Houses of Congress, and as neither he nor his Ministers can be removed from office by a vote of the legislature. Some such arrangement as this seems almost inevitable in a republican system to give proper stability to the executive. In England, through the fact of the nominal head of the State being permanent and irremovable, its actual chief can be changed at any time by a resolution of the House of Commons; but where there is no Sovereign to act as ornamental figure-head, it would probably dangerously weaken the whole fabric of government if the first magistrate could be deprived of his place suddenly and at any time. It appears a necessity to give him a fixed period of office within which he cannot be deposed except for some legal crime; and it cannot be said that the mixture of the American and English systems, with the President endeavouring to fill the place of a constitutional Sovereign, which has been tried in



France, has worked well if tested by its results. At the same time there is little doubt that, as Mr. Bryce shows, under the American constitution there may be and often has been too great a want of union between the President and the legislature, arising in large measure from the fact of the different ways in which they were elected. The best system appears on the whole, at least for a republican country, to be that in which the executive is elected by the legislature for a definite term of years, and best of all, when as in Switzerland, it is not a single man but a body of several persons. Such an arrangement reduces the danger of collision to a minimum, while if the term of the duration of the legislature be co-extensive with that of the executive, and both be fixed sufficiently short, it gives public opinion control enough over the action of the Government and averts the ill effects, of which we have seen so many examples in France, and from which we have not quite been free ourselves, arising from the possibility of a Ministry being suddenly overthrown by a chance combination of parties in Parliament.

The concluding chapters of the first volume are devoted to the consideration of the American constitution as a Federal system.

The characteristic feature of that form of government is that it is a union of States, of which each retain sovereign rights in all matters which are not expressly transferred to the central authority; and further, it is necessary that the respective powers of the Federal government and of the States must be exactly defined in a formal document. As a result, it follows that the American congress is not an absolutely sovereign body like the British Parliament, but can only legislate within the limits permitted it by the constitution, and if it goes beyond these—for instance, if it passes measures encroaching on the rights of the States—its acts are null and void. Of course there must be some body whose function it is to interpret the constitution and decide all disputed questions that may arise as to its exact meaning, and this duty is discharged in America by the judges of the Supreme Court, who are appointed by the President for life with the approval of the Senate. This court has the power of declaring an act of both branches of the legislature, which has received the assent of the President, to be illegal and of no binding force if it transgresses the provisions of the constitution. The only means by which the constitution can be altered is by the process known as a constitutional amendment, which requires the consent of a two-thirds majority in Congress, and a majority of three-fourths of the States.

Another feature noticeable in the American constitution which arises from its Federal character, though not an absolutely necessary consequence of it, is the large amount of independence retained by the States. Except that each State must have a Republican form

of government and must not grant titles of nobility, there are few things which they may not do in the way of internal legislation. European readers will be apt to consider this objectionable, and to ask as Mr. Bryce supposes them to put the question:—

“Is the national government without the power and the duty of correcting the social and political evils which it may find to exist in a particular State, and which the vast majority of the nation may condemn. . . . Is the nation obliged to stand with folded arms while it sees a meritorious minority oppressed, the prosperity of the State ruined, a pernicious example set to other States? Is it to be debarred from using its supreme authority to rectify these mischiefs?”

The words in which our author states the answer an intelligent American would make to these questions are full of weighty wisdom, and have, as will be seen, an obvious bearing upon political controversies among ourselves:—

“As *laissez aller* is the necessary course in a Federal government, so it is the right course in all free governments. Law will never be strong or respected unless it has the sentiment of the people behind it. If the people of a State make bad laws, they will suffer by it. They will be the first to suffer. Let them suffer. Suffering and nothing else will implant that sense of responsibility which is the first step to reform. . . . Is it said that the minority of wise and peaceable citizens may suffer? Let them exert themselves to bring their fellows round to a better mind. Reason and experience will be on their side. We cannot be democrats by halves, and where self-government is given, the majority of the people must rule. Its rule will in the end be better than that of any external power.”

After thus treating of the national government and its relations to the different States, Mr. Bryce proceeds, in the first part of his second volume, to deal with the State governments themselves. This part of his work is more entirely novel than the preceding portion; for while several English writers have given more or less complete accounts of the American Federal constitution, hardly any have described in detail the working of the local legislatures of the States. A special interest and value therefore attaches to the chapters which Mr. Bryce devotes to this branch of his subject.

Every State has a written constitution, which, like the national constitution, cannot be altered by the legislature, but only by a direct vote of the people. The majority required for alteration is not, however, so great as is necessary in the other case, as in most States a simple majority is sufficient. Hence we find that changes are not infrequent, and that many States have adopted new constitutions more than once during the present century. The tendency in the more recent State constitutions as compared with the older ones, is invariably in the direction of greater elaboration and more democratic arrangements. At first, the average length of the document was three or four pages, now it is between twenty and thirty. And in every

case there has been manifested a disposition to impose additional restrictions on the State authorities, and to refer everything to the direct arbitrament of the people.

The most important part of a State constitution is what is known as the "Bill of Rights," an enunciation of the fundamental rights and liberties of the citizens. It is a remarkable fact, not generally known, that while all States provide for full freedom of religious opinion, several exclude avowed Atheists from office. "In Arkansas, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas, a man is declared ineligible for office if he denies the existence of God; in Pennsylvania and Tennessee he is ineligible if he does not believe in God and in the existence of future rewards and punishments. In Arkansas and Maryland such a person is also incompetent as a witness or a juror."

Notwithstanding the wide diversities in character of the States, there is a striking similarity in all the modern constitutions, though, originally, there were strongly-marked differences. In every State there is an elective chief magistrate called the governor, and a legislature of two Houses. The office of governor is older than the American Republic itself, that functionary being the descendant of the old colonial governors appointed by the Crown. After the Revolution the governor was, at first, in most States, elected by the legislature, but the appointment is now, in every case, made by a direct popular vote. The powers of the governor reproduce on a smaller scale those of the President. He is the commander-in-chief of the armed forces of the State, and the head of the administration of justice. He does not, however, nominate the higher State officials, who are popularly elected. The legislature consists of two Houses, named, in most cases, after the two chambers of Congress, the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The advantages of this arrangement are not very obvious. In the Federal Congress, as we have seen, the Senate is necessary to represent the separate sovereignty of the States, but there appears no similar necessity for a second chamber in the case of the State legislatures.

And, in fact, there is, in most cases, hardly any difference in the character of the two bodies. As might be expected in so thoroughly democratic a country, no State imposes a higher property qualification for the election of members of the Upper House; both are chosen by the same electors, the only difference being that the senators are fewer in number than the representatives, and are consequently elected by larger districts. The Senate is also in most States chosen for a longer period, and is not elected all at once like the other House, but partially renewed like a Town Council in England.

In all States except four the governor has a veto in measures passed by the legislature, and Bills returned by him can only be passed against his veto by something more than a bare majority.

The average standard of political ability among the legislative bodies of the States is not, in Mr. Bryce's opinion, a high one, though there are considerable differences between them in this respect. The legislatures of the New England States occupy the first rank in point of the character and dignity of their members, and the worst are those of New York and Pennsylvania, "which, possessing the largest cities, have received the largest influx of European immigrants, and have fallen most completely under the control of unscrupulous party managers." In these States corruption is rife, though even there the majority of the members are personally honest, the proportion of corrupt members being probably about as large as it was in the English House of Commons under Sir Robert Walpole.

That this is a crying evil of American public life cannot be denied; but, at the same time, its extent has often been exaggerated, owing to the fact that the two or three States in which alone it is really greatly prevalent are those most in contact with Europe. And, taken at its worst, it cannot be said to be comparable to the evils characteristic of the military despotisms of Europe, nor even to those which the English government is even now inflicting on unhappy Ireland. Mr. Bryce puts the matter well, when he says:—

"Some sins excite more anger and disgust than they do in England, some are more lightly forgiven or more quickly forgotten. The moral standard of Western America is not quite the same as that of England, just as that of England differs from that of Germany or France."

Self-satisfied, Pharisaical, Unionist members of the English Parliament would no doubt hold up their hands in holy horror at the conduct of American legislators who take money to promote a railway Bill, but the latter would, with at least equal sincerity, express their disgust at Mr. Balfour's brutal treatment of his political prisoners, which these virtuous gentlemen approve of by their votes. And after all cruelty is worse than corruption.

The feature of the State constitutions which seems most objectionable to an English observer is the election of the judges by popular vote, which prevails in most States. The evils which it leads to are, as Mr. Bryce shows, not so great as might be expected. The bench is now rarely actually open to corrupt influences, even in States like Pennsylvania, where bribery is rife in the legislature. Still, however, there is no doubt that the effect of the practice is to fill the judiciary with an inferior body of men, who are in most cases below the standard of the higher class of advocates who plead in their courts, and it is an encouraging sign that, in many recent constitutions, the appointment of the judges has been transferred to the governor, either alone or conjointly with the legislature.

From the State Mr. Bryce passes on to treat of the local government of rural and urban districts, dealing first with the former.

He thus defines the principal forms of local administration :—

“Three types of rural local government are discernible in America. The first is characterized by its unit, the town or township, and exists in the six New England States. The second is characterized by a much larger unit, the county, and prevails in the Southern States. The third combines some features of the first with some of the second, and may be called the mixed system. It is found, under a considerable variety of forms, in the Middle and North-Western States.”

The most interesting of these systems is the first one, which exhibits democracy in its primitive and most perfect form—the primary assembly of the whole adult male community. The “town-meeting” of New England is, in fact, the same as the ancient court or moot of the township in England, and is strictly analogous to the primary assemblies which Mr. Freeman has described in the older Swiss cantons.

By common agreement the rural districts of New England are, as a rule, admirably governed under this system, and it has worked so well there that efforts have been made to transplant it to other parts of the continent.

The systems in which the county is the unit of government are less perfectly organized, and have in every way proved less successful.

From the rural districts our author proceeds to consider the government of cities, a term which in America is applied to any town, however small, possessing a municipal corporation.

The type of municipal government in America varies considerably from the English one, though the names of the principal functionaries are derived from England.

The head of every municipality is called the mayor, but he is not, as in England, elected by the corporation, but directly by the voters of the city. His powers are much more extensive than those of his English prototype, and reproduce on a smaller scale those of the President or State governor.

He has almost everywhere a veto on the resolutions of the corporation, which can only be over-ridden by a two-thirds majority. The corporation or legislative body of the city, unlike any of the reformed municipalities of England, but like the corporation of the city of London, consists in most large cities of two chambers, styled, as in London, the Board of Aldermen, and the Common Council. Both are elected by wards or districts, but the aldermen usually hold office for a longer term than the councillors. Most of the principal municipal officials are not chosen by the corporation but by the popular vote, though in many cases the mayor has the right of appointment.

The government of the large cities is admittedly the least satisfactory department of American public life.

“The faults of the State governments are insignificant when compared

with the extravagance, corruption, and mismanagement which mark the administrations of most of the great cities. For these evils are not confined to one or two great cities. The commonest mistake of Europeans who talk about America is to suppose that the political vices of New York are found everywhere. The next most common is to suppose they are found nowhere else. In New York they have revealed themselves on the largest scale. They are 'gross as a mountain, monstrous, palpable.' But there is not a city with a population exceeding 200,000 where the poison germs have not sprung into a vigorous life; and in some of the smaller ones, down to 70,000, it needs no microscope to note the results of their growth."

Bad, however, as things still are in New York and other cities, there is a general concurrence of opinion that they are improving, and those in Europe who are so apt to point the finger of scorn at the Americans for the corruption of their great municipalities, should remember that if their own country is not afflicted by the same evils to a similar extent, yet it has probably other and greater ones. Even New York would be considered by most liberty-loving Englishmen a better place to live in than Berlin or Vienna. The way in which the superior class of American public men look on these matters is well shown in a chapter contributed to Mr. Bryce's book by Mr. Seth Low, late mayor of the city of Brooklyn, in which he succeeded in carrying out a thorough reform in its administration, which has rendered it a model to other cities.

The following extract from Mr. Low's pages is well worthy of careful attention:—

"Any European student of politics who wishes to understand the problem of government in the United States, whether of city government or any other form of it, must first of all transfer himself, if he can, to a point of view precisely the opposite of that which is natural to him. This is scarcely, if at all, less true of the English than of the Continental student. In England, as upon the Continent, from time immemorial, government has descended from the top down. Until recently, society in Europe has accepted the idea, almost without protest, that there must be governing classes, and that the great majority of men must be governed. In the United States that idea does not obtain, and, what is of scarcely less importance, it never has obtained. No distinction is recognized between governing and governed classes, and the problem of government is conceived to be this—that the whole of society should learn and apply to itself the art of government. Bearing this in mind, it becomes apparent that the immense tide of immigration into the United States is a continually disturbing factor. The immigrants come from many countries, a very large proportion of them being from the classes which, in their old homes, from time out of mind have been governed. Arriving in America, they shortly become citizens of a country which undertakes to govern itself. However well disposed they may be as a rule, they have not had experience in self-government, nor do they always share the ideas which have expressed themselves in the Constitution of the United States. . . . In many of the cities of the United States, indeed in almost all of them, the population not only is thus largely untrained in the art of self-government, but it is not even homogeneous. So that an American city is confronted not only

with the necessity of instructing large and rapidly growing bodies of people in the art of government, but it is compelled at the same time to assimilate strangely different component parts into an American community. . . . The problem will never be anything but a most difficult one, but, with all its difficulties, there is every reason to be hopeful."

Having thus fully described the framework of the government of the United States in all its branches, Mr. Bryce proceeds, in the last half of his second volume, to consider its animating spirit—the American party-system.

No writer, either in Europe or America, has treated of this subject in such full detail before, and no part of the work will be more useful in giving English readers clear ideas instead of confused ones. Few Englishmen have any very definite knowledge as to the history and principles of the two great political parties in America. They are apt to identify them with the familiar parties of their own land, and of most other constitutionally governed countries in Europe—Liberals and Conservatives, the supporters of progress and the enemies of change.

Such identifications, however, are thoroughly misleading. Neither party in America has ever claimed, as its distinguishing feature, either the principle of progress or that of reaction, as they are understood in England, nor can it be said that either of them have been mainly influenced, though unconsciously, by one or other of these principles.

The real dividing line has been a question which cannot be a political issue at present in England, but which in all Federal constitutions is almost certain to be a burning subject of controversy—the exact limits of the respective powers of the national government and those of the States. There will always be in a federation one party disposed to magnify the rights of the central authority, and another which will take its stand on the principle of the rights of the States. And this controversy in America is as old as the Union itself. The following passage will explain the origin of the dispute :—

"When the machinery had been set in motion by the choice of George Washington as President, in the President's cabinet, Hamilton, Secretary of the Treasury, counselled a line of action which required the exercise of large powers by the Federal government, while Jefferson, the Secretary of State, desired to practically restrict its action to foreign affairs. The advocates of a central national authority began to receive the name of Federalists. . . . The party of Jefferson sought to restrict the interference of the central government with the States, and to allow the fullest play to the sentiment of State independence. This party took the name of Republicans, or Democratic Republicans, and they are the predecessors of the present Democrats (not of the modern Republicans, who are the representatives of the old Federalists)."

The Federalist party were at first the strongest, and the successor of Washington in the Presidency, Adams, was the leader of that

party. At the next election, however, the ability and energy of the Republican leader, Jefferson, triumphed. He held the Presidency for two terms, and was succeeded by a follower of his, Madison, who also retained power for eight years, and he again by another Republican President, Monroe. In fact, by 1815, the Federalist party had practically ceased to exist, and the Republicans were left in undisturbed possession of the field. Dissensions, however, soon began to spring up in the victorious party itself, and about 1830 there were again two rival parties, one of which, now known as Democrats, carried on the traditions of the Jeffersonian Republicans, while the other, called ultimately the Whig party, represented many, though not all, of the views of the former Federalists.

Soon a much more burning question arose than the dispute about the respective rights of the Union and the States—the question of the extension of slavery into new territories. The Democratic party, which found its main support in the South, adopted the doctrine that Congress had no power to forbid slavery in the territories, while the Whigs inclined to the opposite view, but did not venture to take a decided position for fear of losing the support of their southern partisans. Their feeble and vacillating conduct led to the break-up of their party in 1852-4, and the formation, in 1856, of a new party, which took the name of Republican, which had for its platform the right of Congress to restrict slavery. It was this party which triumphed in the election of Abraham Lincoln, and which held power during the civil war, and for twenty years afterwards. It was of course the asserter of the rights of the central government in a much greater degree than the Whig party, or even the old Federalists, had been, and during the war, as was inevitable, the authority of the Federal power was stretched to previously unheard-of lengths.

“When the war was over there came the difficult task of reconstructing the now reconquered slave States, and of securing the position in them of the lately liberated negroes. The outrages perpetrated on the latter and on white settlers in some parts of the South required further exertions of Federal authority, and made the question of the limit of that authority still a practical one, for the old Democratic party, almost silenced during the war, had now reappeared in full force as the advocate of State rights, and the watchful critic of any undue stretches of Federal authority.”

But the troubles arising out of the war gradually settled down, and at the present day the question of States' rights can hardly be said to be a practical point of controversy. There really appears to be no great principle at present at issue between the two parties, and both are living, to a large extent, on the memories of the past. The Republican party still finds its main support in the north and west, and the Democrats in the south, while in the middle States the parties are nearly balanced, and the majority shifts from side to side, as is strikingly shown in the great State of New York, which



since 1860 has always given its vote in regular alternation to each of the two parties at the quadrennial Presidential elections.

The system of party organization in America is a rather complex one. There are two distinct sets of bodies—one permanent, and the other temporary. The permanent political associations or managing committees, as they are called, are of the same character as in England.

Every electoral district has a committee, chosen by the voters of each of the political parties, to manage the party business; these committees in turn send delegates to the managing committee of the State, and the State committees in turn to the National Republican or Democratic committee, answering to the National Liberal Federation or union of Conservative associations in England.

These committees transact the ordinary business of the party, and perform all the work of elections, except the selection of candidates. That function belongs to another set of bodies—the electoral conventions, which are temporary, and meet only for the particular purpose of choosing the party nominees. They are organized on the same basis as the permanent committees, each electoral district selecting its candidates, and sending delegates to the State convention, which chooses the party candidate for the governorship, and the State conventions sending delegates to the great National conventions, which meet every four years to nominate the candidates for the presidency.

In the great cities both sets of associations tend to fall under the control of cliques, which are known as Rings, and are generally under the control of some one prominent party manager, who is called the Boss.

The name of this functionary is not altogether unfamiliar to English readers, but few have very clear ideas as to his position, for which it would be difficult to find any precise analogy in this country, or indeed anywhere out of America.

The following extracts from Mr. Bryce's pages will make the matter plainer:—

"The head of the Ring is a general. He dispenses places, rewards the loyal, punishes the mutinous, concocts schemes, negotiates treaties. He generally avoids publicity, preferring the substance to the shadow of power, and is all the more dangerous because he sits like a spider hidden in the midst of his web. He is a Boss. . . . A Boss needs fewer showy gifts than a European demagogue. His special theatre is neither the halls of the legislature nor the platform, but the committee-room. A power of rough and ready repartee, or a turn for florid declamation, will help him; but he can dispense with both. What he needs are the arts of intrigue, and that knowledge of men which teaches him when to bully, when to cajole, whom to attract by the hope of gain, whom by appeals to party loyalty."

The political methods of these bosses and rings are, as might be expected, by no means of a refined or elevated character, but it is

hard to see in what respect they are more morally blamable than those of the knights and dames of the Primrose League in England. Bad as is the corruption prevailing in many American cities, it is in no sense a greater outrage on the principle of popular government than the organized system of intimidation which in many English rural districts makes the grant of the franchise to the labourers little better than a mockery. And be it remembered nothing approaching to this terrorism exists in America, except in the case of the negroes in the Southern States. No white voter, whose party happens to be in a minority in a particular district, has to dread any of the consequences which are likely enough to befall a shopkeeper or workman known to be a Radical in a village in Kent or Sussex.

The most important of the political organizations in the United States are, of course, the conventions which meet every four years to nominate the Presidential candidates, and Mr. Bryce's account of these assemblies, drawn from personal experience, is exceedingly interesting. He thus describes the preliminaries of the meeting :—

“ Four or five days before the day fixed for the opening of the convention, the delegations begin to flock into the city where it is to be held. Some come attended by a host of friends and camp-followers, and are received at the railway terminus by the politicians of the city, with bands of music and an admiring crowd. Thus Tammany Hall, the famous Democratic Club of New York, came six hundred strong to Chicago in July 1884, filling two special trains. A great crowd met it at the station, and it marched, following its boss, to its head-quarters at the Palmer Hotel in procession, each member wearing its badges, just as the retainers of Earl Warwick, the King-maker, used to follow him through the streets of London, with the Bear and Ragged Staff upon their sleeves. . . . Before the great day dawns, many thousands of politicians, newspaper men, and sight-seers have filled to overflowing every hotel in the city, and crowded the main thoroughfares, so that the horse-cars can scarcely penetrate the throng. It is like a mediæval pilgrimage or the mustering of a great army. When the chief delegations have arrived, the work begins in earnest. Not only each large delegation, but the faction of each leading aspirant to the candidacy, has its head-quarters, where the managers hold perpetual session, reckoning up their numbers, starting rumours meant to exaggerate their strength and resources and dishearten their opponents, organizing raids upon the less experienced delegates as they arrive. Some fill the entrance halls and bars of the hotels, talk to the busy reporters, extemporize meetings with tumultuous cheering for their favourite.”

The following account is given of the actual commencement of the proceedings ; and the fact that political gatherings in America are opened by a religious service will certainly be new and surprising to most Englishmen :—

“ At length the period of expectation and preparation is over, and the summer sun rises upon the fateful day to which every politician in the party has looked forward for three years. Long before the time fixed for

the beginning of business, every part of the hall—a hall often large enough to hold from ten to fifteen thousand—is crowded. The delegates, who in 1884 were 820 in number, are a mere drop in the ocean. Eminent politicians from every State of the Union, senators and representatives from Washington, not a few journalists and reporters, ladies, sight-seers from distant cities, as well as a swarm of partisans from the city itself, press in, some semblance of order being kept by the sergeant-at-arms and his marshals. Some wear devices, sometimes the badge of their State or of their organization, sometimes the colours or emblem of their favourite aspirant. Each State delegation has its allotted place marked by the flag of the State floating from a pole; but leaders may be seen passing from one group to another, while the spectators listen to the band playing popular airs, and cheer any well-known figure that enters. When the assembly is called to order, a prayer is offered—each day's sitting begins with a prayer—by some clergyman of local eminence, the susceptibilities of various denominations being duly respected in the selection, and business proceeds."

The first stage of the proceedings of the convention is the election of a chairman, then comes the appointment of a committee to draw up what is known as the "platform," or declaration of the principles of the party, then comes the nomination of candidates for the Presidency, and the balloting, a process which sometimes extends over several days. It is requisite that the selected candidate should have an absolute majority of the convention, and this rarely happens at the first, or even the second or third ballot. "When at last the result is announced, the partisans of the chosen candidate go wild with delight, salvos of artillery are fired off, processions with bands parade the streets, 'campaign clubs' bearing the candidate's name are organized on the spot."

A presidential campaign in America is a much longer and more exciting contest than a general election in England, and its incidents must be of a decidedly more picturesque nature—

"For three months, processions, usually with brass bands, flags, badges, crowds of cheering spectators, are the order of the day and night from end to end of the country. When a procession is exceptionally large it is called a parade. In New York City, on October 29, 1884, the business men who supported Mr. Blaine held such a demonstration. They were organized by profession or occupation; the lawyers, 800 strong, forming one battalion, the dry-goods men another, the produce exchange a third, the bankers a fourth, the brokers a fifth, the jewellers a sixth, and so on *ad infinitum*. Rain fell incessantly, and the streets were deep with mud, but neither rain above nor mud below dampened the spirits of this great army, which marched steadily along, chanting various campaign refrains. . . . Imagine 800 English barristers turning out from the Temple and Lincoln's Inn, to walk in slow procession from London Bridge to South Kensington, shouting themselves hoarse for Gladstone or Disraeli!"

With all this excitement, however, there is very little disturbance. Riots are rare, and "neither party dreams of disturbing the

parades or meetings of the other," a point in which both English parties might imitate them with advantage. Those superfine writers in this country who are disposed to dwell so much on the questionable features of American politics might do well to remember that it would not enter the head of the most unscrupulous boss to hire roughs with the deliberate purpose of breaking up the meetings of the opposite party, as Conservatives of good position were not ashamed to do during the Jingo period.

Mr. Bryce's third and last volume is divided into three sections, the first of which is entitled "Public Opinion." As he truly says, there is no country in the world in which public opinion has a greater influence on government than in the United States, and his analysis of its nature and methods is well worth careful study. One great difference between America and England in this respect is that in the former there is no sharp line of distinction between the opinion of "the masses" and that of "the classes."

"In the United States public opinion is the opinion of the whole nation, with little distinction of social classes. Nor is there any one class, or set of men, or any one social layer which more than another originates ideas and builds up political doctrine for the mass. The opinion of the nation is the resultant of the views, not of a number of classes, but of a multitude of individuals, diverse, no doubt, from one another, but for the purposes of politics, far less diverse than if they were members of groups defined by social rank or by property."

The organs of public opinion are mostly the same as in this country, though with some variations in their relative importance. Of the Press in the United States Mr. Bryce's judgment is more favourable than that of English writers is wont to be. He considers that on the whole it serves as a mirror of current opinion rather better than the English Press, and does not regard its character as being altogether so inferior as it is frequently represented. Political meetings, except at election times, are not so frequent in America as in England, and are less often held for purposes of instruction and as demonstrations of opinion. In one of the most instructive of his chapters Mr. Bryce deals with "National characteristics as moulding public opinion," and his picture of the character of the American people as a whole is very favourable, though there are few, if any, critics in this country who have a right to pronounce it too partial. A few sentences will show the general drift of his remarks:—

"The Americans are a good-natured people, kindly helpful to one another, disposed to take a charitable view even of wrong-doers. Nowhere is cruelty more abhorred. . . . They are a moral and well-conducted people. . . . They are also a religious people. Christianity influences conduct not indeed half as much as in theory it ought, but probably more

than it does in any other modern country, and far more than it did in the so-called ages of faith."

What is termed the "tyranny of the majority" is often supposed to be a fault of democracies in general and of the people of the United States in particular. Mr. Bryce devotes a chapter to this subject, and his conclusion is that the charge is at present by no means well founded, though undoubtedly there was much reason for it half a century ago. As for any abuse of their powers of legislation by the majority so as to oppress the minority, no instance of it can be adduced either from the laws passed by Congress or from those of the separate States. And even in the action of public sentiment outside the sphere of law, there is nothing that can fairly be called a tyranny.

"If social persecution exists in the America of to-day it is only in a few dark corners. One may travel all over the Northern and Western States, mingling with all classes and reading the newspapers without hearing of it. No one is made to suffer in mind, body, or estate for simply holding aloof from a religious or other voluntary association. He would be more likely to suffer in an English village. It is the same as regards social questions, and of course as regards politics. To boycott a man for his politics, or even to discourage his shop in the way not uncommon in some parts of rural England and Ireland, would excite indignation in America."

Mr. Bryce winds up this section of his work with considering "wherein public opinion fails" and "wherein it succeeds." His general conclusions on the matter are thus summarized:—

"The failures of public opinion are primarily due to the want of appropriate machinery; they are increased by its characteristic temper. Quick and strenuous in great matters, it is heedless in small matters, over-kindly and indulgent in all matters. It suffers many weeds to go on growing till they have struck deep root in the soil. . . . But if public opinion is heedless in small things, it usually checks measures which, even if not oppressive, are palpably selfish or unwise. If, before a mischievous Bill passes, its opponents can get the attention of the people fixed upon it, its chances are slight. . . . In questions of foreign policy, opinion is a valuable reserve force. Among the ordinary native citizens one finds less obtrusive selfishness, less chauvinism, less cynicism in declaring one's own national interests to be paramount to those of other States, than in any of the great States of Europe. Justice and equity are more generally recognized as binding upon nations no less than on individuals. Whenever humanity comes into question, the heart of the people is sound."

It may be added that the direction of American opinion on European questions has almost always been on the side of justice and freedom.

English Liberals cannot fail to remember with gratitude that they had the sympathy of the whole American Press with them in the struggle against Jingoism from 1876 to 1880, at a time

when the columns of the Tory journals were filled with extracts from the representatives of so-called "Liberal opinion" on the Continent, tending to the glorification of Lord Beaconsfield. And though it suits Unionists in England to ascribe the support given, with hardly an exception, by American writers and public men to the cause of Home Rule for Ireland merely to a desire to conciliate the Irish vote, yet the sympathy with Ireland and the English Liberal party is much too generally diffused and is found in writers too remote for the class of professional politicians for such motives to be at all an adequate explanation of the facts. No better proof could be given of the essential moral soundness of the American people than the fact that Mr. Gladstone's greatness is so thoroughly appreciated by them, perhaps better even than in his own country. No American feels anything but contemptuous disgust for the language of such representatives of the baser class of Unionists as the *Times*, the *St. James's Gazette* and the *Saturday Review* about the great Liberal leader.

In the last two divisions of his work, under the headings of "Illustrations and Reflections," and "Social Institutions," Mr. Bryce treats of a great variety of miscellaneous subjects, on all of which his observations are worth careful study, but there is only space left to touch in a few of the points noticed by him. He deals briefly in one chapter with "The problem of territorial extension," and remarks how completely the apprehension, has passed away, which was once so rife in this country, of an attempt by the United States to conquer Canada:—

"Fifty years ago it was deemed a matter of course that the Americans would seek to annex Canada, peaceably if possible, but if not, then by force of arms. Even so late as 1864 Englishmen were constantly told that the first result of the triumph of the Federal armies in the War of Secession would be to launch a host flushed with victory against the Canadian Dominion, because when the passion for war has once been roused in a nation, it clamours for fresh conquests. . . . Yet now the absorption of Canada is seldom mentioned in the United States. If it comes about, it will come about at the wish and by the act of the Canadians themselves, rather than as the result of any external force."

Still less is there any desire to extend the southern frontier of the United States by the annexation of Mexico, or, as at one time seemed likely, to seize upon the West Indian Islands.

"There is, however, one spot beyond the limits of the North American continent in which Americans declare they feel directly interested. This is the island group of Hawaii, which lies 2000 miles to the south-west of San Francisco. Great as the distance is, the Americans conceive that the position of these isles over against their own western coast would be so threatening to their commerce in a war between the United States and any

European Power, that they cannot suffer the islands to be occupied by or even fall under the influence of any European nation."

Mr. Bryce commences his remarks on the social features of the United States with a chapter on the American Bar. The legal profession in America differs from that of this country in their being no distinction between barristers and solicitors. "Every lawyer is permitted to take every kind of business. He is employed, not like the English barrister, by another professional man, but by the client himself, who seeks him out and makes his bargain directly with him." Of the character of the profession in general, Mr. Bryce has a high opinion, and thinks it can well bear comparison with the English Bar in this respect. Curiously enough, American lawyers are, on the whole, more conservative than their brethren in England. "One finds the same dislike to theory, the same attachment to old forms, the same unwillingness to be committed to any broad principle, which distinguished the orthodox type of English lawyers sixty years ago."

From the Bar as one of the learned professions the transition is easy to the seats of learning, and a long chapter is devoted to the American Universities. Of these there are a great number, every State legislature having the power to grant charters to educational bodies bestowing the right of conferring degrees. Of course, there are comparatively few of these institutions which are universities in the European sense. "Not more than twelve, and possibly only eight or nine, of the American institutions would fall within the definition."

But even the small colleges in the western States, which are practically merely superior public schools, are regarded by Mr. Bryce as performing a useful function. "They get hold of a multitude of poor men, who might never resort to a distant place of education. They set learning in a visible form, plain indeed and humble, but dignified even in her humility, before the eyes of a rustic people, in whom the love of knowledge, naturally strong, might never break from the bud into the flower but for the care of some zealous gardener." And the great universities of the Atlantic States are quite on a level with those of Europe: "Resolved to bring their highest education up to the European standard, and to keep pace with the progress of science, filled with that love of experiment and spirit of enterprise which are so much stronger in America than anywhere else in the world."

Two chapters are occupied with the religious and ecclesiastical condition of the United States. There is, of course, no established church in America, and the Constitution contains an express provision against the support of any particular form of religion by the State. English inquirers will naturally ask, What are the results

of this state of things, and how far the blessings or evils anticipated by the supporters and opponents of disestablishment among us are realized? As Mr. Bryce puts it:—

“There are two evil consequences with which the European defenders of established churches seek to terrify us when disestablishment and disendowment are mentioned—one, that the authority and influence of religion will wane if State recognition is withdrawn; the other, that the incomes of the clergy and their social status will sink, that they will, in fact, become plebeians, and that the centres of light which now exist in every country parish will be extinguished. There are also two benefits which the advocates of the ‘Free Church in a Free State’ promise us,—one, that social jealousies and bitternesses between different sects will melt away: and the other, that the church herself will become more spiritual in her temper and ideas, more earnest in her proper work and the nurture of the soul. What has America experience to say on these four points?”

Mr. Bryce's answer on each head, though stated with caution and moderation, is decidedly in favour of the principle of religious equality, as tested by its results.

“So far from suffering from the want of State support, religion seems in the United States to stand all the firmer, because standing alone she is seen to stand by her own strength. . . . The social and economic position of the clergy in the United States is above that of the priesthood as a whole in Roman Catholic countries, and of all denominations, Anglican and Nonconformist, in England. . . . Social jealousies connected with religion scarcely exist in America, and one notices a kindlier feeling between all denominations, Roman Catholics included, and a greater readiness to work together for common charitable aims, than between Catholics and Protestants in France or Germany, or between Anglicans and Nonconformists in England. . . . There is a spiritual gain in the diminution of envy, malice and uncharitableness between the clergy of different sects, which has resulted from their all being on the same legal level, and the absence of these faults, and of the habit of bringing ecclesiastical questions into secular politics, gives the enemy less occasion to blaspheme than he is apt to have in Europe.”

Of the social as well as the religious life of America, Mr. Bryce's impressions are decidedly favourable, and he regards “pleasantness” as one of its distinguishing features. This, it may be said, is a matter of taste, and, no doubt, other English writers have expressed opposite views; but Mr. Bryce's judgment applies to a more recent period than that of most of them, and is less founded on merely superficial characteristics.

“It is true,” he says, “that there are elements in the life of the United States which may well make a European of any class prefer to dwell there rather than in the land of his birth. In the first place there is the general prosperity and material well-being of the greater part of the inhabitants. . . . I doubt if any European can realize, till he has been in America, how much difference it makes to the happiness of anyone not wholly devoid



of sympathy with his fellow-beings, to feel that all round him in all classes of society and all parts of the country, there exist in such ample measure so many of the external conditions of happiness, abundance of the necessaries of life, easy command of education and books, amusements and leisure to enjoy them, comparatively few temptations to intemperance and vice. The second charm of American life is one which some Europeans will smile at. It is social equality. To many Europeans the word has an odious sound. It suggests a dirty fellow in a blouse, elbowing his betters in a crowd, or an ill-conditioned villager shaking his fist at the parson or the squire, or, at any rate, it suggests obtrusiveness and bad manners. The exact contrary is the truth; equality improves manners, for it strengthens the basis of all good manners, respect for other men and women simply as men and women, irrespective of their station in life . . . . I come last to the character and ways of the Americans themselves, in which there is a certain charm hard to convey by description, but felt almost as soon as one sets foot on their shore and felt constantly thereafter. They are a kindly people. Good nature, heartiness, a readiness to render small services to one another, seem to be everywhere in the air, and in those who breathe it. . . . People seem to take their own troubles more lightly than they do in Europe, and to be more indulgent to the faults by which troubles are caused. They have a remarkable faculty for enjoyment, a power of drawing more happiness from obvious pleasures, simple and innocent pleasures, than one often finds in overburdened Europe."

In his two final chapters Mr. Bryce discusses the future of the United States politically and socially. Though his forecasts are expressed with the cautious reserve everywhere manifested in his volumes, they are decidedly and with good reason hopeful. He has nowhere sought to conceal the admitted evils of American public life, about which English writers, who are often the upholders of worse abuses in their own country, wax so virtuously indignant, but he adduces good reasons for believing that there is a steady tendency to improvement:—

"The Presidents of this generation are abler men than those of fifty years ago, and less apt to be the mere creatures of a host of party managers. The poisonous influence of slavery is no longer felt. There is every day less of sentimentalism but not less of earnestness in political discussions. There is less blind obedience to party, less disposition to palliate sins committed from party motives. That it should be taken as a good sign when the young men of a city throw themselves into politics shows that the new generation is believed to have either a higher sense of public duty, or a less slavish attachment to party ties than that whose votes have prevailed for the last twenty years. A retrospect which shows us that some evils have declined or vanished, while the regenerative forces are more numerous and more active, encourages us in the belief that the general stream of tendency is towards improvement, and will in time bring the public life of the country nearer to the ideal which democracy is bound to set before itself."

And in other matters than politics there is equally good ground for looking hopefully to the future.

Whatever faults may be found with the people of the United

States, no one can deny that they enjoy in larger measure than any other nation what their great historian Motley truly describes as "that without which the highest human blessings are worthless : freedom of thought, speech and action." Or, as Mr. Bryce puts it in his concluding words :—

"That America marks the highest level, not only of material well-being, but of intelligence and happiness, which the race has yet attained, will be the judgment of those who look not at the favoured few, for whose benefit the world seems hitherto to have formed its institutions, but at the whole body of the people."

## PARLIAMENT AND THE SCOTTISH UNIVERSITIES.

THE present seems a suitable occasion for reviewing, from a practical standpoint, the actual position as regards legislation for the Scottish universities. For the sixth time a Government measure on the subject has been introduced; and it has been received by its supporters with languid and qualified approval, and by its opponents with declarations of uncompromising hostility on the smallest of side issues. Even among Scottish members of Parliament there is little knowledge of the question; genuine interest in it is rare; and we trust it is not too late to call attention to some of the larger elements which enter into the Universities (Scotland) Bill, with the hope of contributing in some degree to an improved solution of the problem. In this hope we venture to address some considerations to those who are accustomed both to take sober views of what is at any time attainable and to test with care and method the means proposed for its attainment. We shall say nothing of the burning questions which have been debated so long and so fruitlessly—extra-mural teaching, professorial monopoly, education of women, theological chairs, theological tests, or the recent mysterious apparition of the affiliation clauses. The very heat which is caused in different academic circles by the mention of these subjects seems to indicate that they are not yet ripe for final settlement; and, while this is an excellent excuse for passing them by, it is a strong reason for rigorously examining a scheme which purports to provide for the future of the university system.

The new Bill, like its late predecessors, consists of three essentially distinct parts. In the first place, it confers upon an Executive Commission certain large and varied powers. A curious illustration may be given of the style in which this part of the Bill was originally drafted. When the Bill of last session was introduced into the House of Lords, the power of the commission to authorize the university education of women was so limited that if any university, with or without the authority of the commission, had opened classes for women *except with a view to graduation*, or had permitted classes for women to be conducted by lecturers, assistants, or fellows *other than*

*professors*, it would have acted illegally. Such a restriction was so wanton that it was obviously unintentional; and when the effect of the words was pointed out, an amendment was at once accepted by the Government. The incident is noteworthy, because it shows the need for vigilant criticism of the minor details of the Bill. Such minute criticism, however, does not come within the scope of this paper, nor do we intend to discuss the proposed personal composition of the Executive Commission.

The commission is to be appointed for a term of two years, but its existence may be continued "for such time as her Majesty thinks fit." At the end of that time, it is supposed, almost all the internal arrangements of the universities, including not only educational matters but also finances and endowments, will have been revised and settled on a permanent basis. The ordinances of the commission, however, will not take effect until they have been "published, laid before Parliament, and approved by her Majesty in Council." The publicity thus ensured is a guarantee that nothing will be done without full consideration; and we may reasonably expect that the commission will have a fair measure of success in sweeping away the dust and cobwebs which have gathered about the Scottish universities. Even so, it is still our duty to ask how we can prevent their recurrence in the future; and we shall endeavour hereafter to show in what respects the Bill fails to fulfil this task.

As the appointment of the commission is in the popular estimation the chief object, we may regard the powers conferred upon it as the main body, of the Bill. The executive power of the commission may thus be regarded as the general rule, and the two other parts of the measure as exceptions: in the one case the commissioners have merely a power to report; in the other they have no power or control whatever.

The first exception need not detain us long. It is an interesting subject for speculation why the Government should give the commissioners power to report, but no power to make ordinances, on the question of theological tests. If the question is in any degree "ripe," surely the commissioners might be trusted to deal with it discreetly; and surely the publication of their ordinances and the approval of the Privy Council Committee would be a sufficient safeguard, in this as in other cases, against unwise or precipitate action. But if the question is not ripe, it seems a pity to divert the commissioners from their urgent and multifarious duties in order to prepare a report which will admittedly be of no use except possibly as a guide to distant legislation. In fine, there seems to be no good practical reason why this exceptional power should not be either assimilated to the other powers of the commission or struck out of the Bill.

The second exception is, however, far more important. The Bill :

directly lays down the framework and mechanism of the constitution, upon the satisfactory working of which will depend (after the termination of the commission) the welfare and development of the whole university system. We propose to dwell at length on this part of the measure, because the precise range of its operation is seldom realized. We believe not only that the plan is defective in itself, but that there is a large class of questions for which it fails to provide, that this omission will most probably produce sooner or later a deadlock comparable to the present state of affairs, and that this is the more deplorable because, with reasonable foresight, a comparatively simple remedy is possible.

Under the Government scheme, each university will in future be governed, not by the Senate, but by a modified University Court, in accordance with the ordinances of the Executive Commission. A new body, the Privy Council Committee, is called into existence to give or refuse its sanction when a University Court wishes an alteration in any ordinance affecting it. The principle of the scheme thus outlined is embodied in the popular maxim: The professors, as such, ought not to have the sole control of university administration. This is an accepted principle; but it does not follow that the University Court, as reconstituted by the Bill, is the best available substitute for the present Senate. A methodical consideration of the facts rather shows that the first step to the solution consists in the reconstruction of the Senate.

The Senate, the present governing body, suffers from three striking defects, and we touch upon them only because knowledge of the fault is in each case an easy guide to the cure. Its proceedings are secret; it embraces all the professors; and it includes none but professors.

1. The privacy which shrouds the administration of the universities is well known, but the practical inference from the fact is generally overlooked. Before we talk of cashiering an official, we are bound to ask how far his faults are due to the conditions under which he acts, and for which we are responsible. We think it clear that if the meetings of the Senate had been held in public during the last ten or twenty years, matters would now have been in a different condition. Not that this involves a censure on the professors. But the most competent and disinterested of men are seldom the worse for the stimulus of informed public criticism; and the natural frailty and drowsiness of man too easily converts the august council chamber into a splendid dormitory. We may, without reproach, apply to so venerable a body as the Senate the principle to which a keen judge of men has attributed the purity and efficiency of British Themis. "Our judges," says Charles Reade, "are an honour to Europe, not because Nature has cut them out of a different stuff from Italian judges; this is the dream or

babies; it is because they sit in courts open to the public, and *sit next day in the newspapers.*" It is not enough to depose the Senate, and enthrone a new body in its room, if the sittings of that body are still to be held in private. No doubt there are questions of university discipline and scandal where privacy would still be advisable, and a power should therefore be reserved to sit in private when necessary; but in general the meetings of the Senate should be open, and there can be little doubt that everybody would gain in the end by this plain expedient.

2. The mere fact that a man is a professor of learning does not qualify him for administrative work; and it is notorious that many professors are unfitted for it, and dislike it. The rational course, then, is to select the fittest as representatives; and the best method of doing so probably lies in the development of the separate Faculties. Each Faculty should elect a representative or representatives to the Senate, combining this duty with the active duties of a Board of Studies. And the conjoined Faculties—i.e., the professors as a body—should have no duties except to determine questions common to all the Faculties, or referred to them by the Senate.

3. The mode of appointing members of Senate other than professors is a subject on which much difference of opinion may reasonably exist. We instance one plan merely by way of illustration. Several members should be elected by the General Council and by the Municipal Council; and others by various public bodies interested in learning or business; for example, in Edinburgh, by some or all of the following:—The Faculty of Advocates, the Royal Society, the Chamber of Commerce, the Royal College of Surgeons, and others. The object should be, not to import eminent specialists, but to infuse fresh and vigorous administrative power into the academic system, and at the same time, if possible, to restore and strengthen in extra-academic circles and institutions that sympathetic interest in our seats of learning which is at all times apt to become dim.

It will be noticed that we do not suggest a numerical limit, or specify any fixed ratio between the professorial and other members of the Senate. These are details immaterial to the argument. But we take the occasion to condemn the provision contained in the Government Bill that of the fifteen members of the governing body (exclusive of the Principal) not more than four shall in any case be professors. There are always more than four professors who are men of strong administrative ability and practically acquainted with methods of university administration. Why should the university be deprived of their services? If the General Council or any other electoral person or body wishes to appoint a professor as representative, why should the appointment be absolutely prohibited? The rule is, of course, defended on the ground that the governing body

will be the theatre of warring interests, and that by an excessive representation of the professoriate the balance of power would be overthrown. The argument seems to neglect the value of publicity as a check on selfish interest, where that exists; and one cannot help suspecting that there must be some fundamental error in the structure of machinery which is so easily disordered. Indeed, the defenders of the rule do not appear to be quite logical. If their view is right, it should be needless to forbid the appointment of professors, for the persons appointing would naturally feel bound to select others than professors as champions of their own interests and ideas. And they ought in consistency to look forward to a good deal of jealousy and friction between the governing body and the professors—a state of things for which they seem to have made very insufficient provision.

The Senate, if thus remodelled, would possess all the powers now wielded by the Senate, and would therefore occupy the place in the University Constitution which the Bill assigns to the University Court. Were this the whole effect of our suggestions we might not unjustly be charged with advocating little more than a change of names. But the signal advantage of this mode of approaching the question is that it clears the way for a further advance; and it is here that we turn our back decisively upon the Bill. The next step involves a reversal of the popular view that the administrative functions of the Senate should be transferred to the University Court: on the contrary, nearly all the functions of the Court ought to be transferred to the reconstructed Senate, and the Court as a separate university body should be abolished; or, rather, the administration of each university being controlled by the new Senate, the four Courts should be merged in a Permanent University Commission, possessing large judicial and quasi-legislative powers over university and inter-university questions. After the analogy of the Railway Commission, it should be composed of a judge of the Court of Session and two lay members; but as the labours of such a commission would be very light, the members need not be paid; and the clerical and official work connected with it could be cheaply conducted in the Scottish Education Office. In a sense, the Permanent Commission would take the place of the proposed Privy Council Committee, but with far greater powers than that somewhat ornamental body. In the appointment of such a judicial commission lies the best hope for the steady and harmonious development of our university system after the Executive Commission has concluded its labours. We propose to give several illustrations of the need for such a Permanent Commission, and of its utility; but it must be borne in mind that we state them only as crucial tests of mechanism, and as typical of many questions now existing, and of many more which will emerge for solution in the future.

I. The Executive Commission is directed to apportion among the four universities the annual fund to be granted by Parliament. This apportionment will be final; and, however inequitable it may hereafter become through change of circumstances or mere lapse of time, no alteration will be possible except by Act of Parliament. Now, can any reasonable man suppose that, if a similar fund had been distributed among the universities twenty years ago, the partition would have been acquiesced in to this day? Is it likely that the apportionment by the commission, even if satisfactory for a year or two, will be regarded with general approval ten or twenty years hence? Prudence seems to demand that there should be some method of subjecting it to review. Do we, then, wish to see it frequently altered? No. We wish to supply an available remedy for injustice, and so prevent that discontent which springs from the feeling of injustice. Practical men are aware that the mere existence of a competent and accessible tribunal is a security for justice in many cases where no appeal is made to it. Groundless complaints of wrong are hushed, and hosts of disputes are settled by reasonable concession and agreement, when the parties know that a competent Court is ready to decide the matter.

It is sometimes supposed that disputes or complaints of this kind will be dealt with by the Privy Council Committee. This is a mistake. It is certain that, under the Bill, the Privy Council Committee will possess no such power, and that the only possible remedy would lie in the intervention of Parliament. We submit that in these cases Parliament is a most undesirable tribunal. The proposed Permanent Commission would decide them swiftly and justly; the want of it opens a prospect of incessant bickering, of newspaper controversy, of an atmosphere of agitation and prolonged unrest very unfavourable to academic life. Our aim should be to substitute reasoned argument for agitation, an equitable Court for the incalculable chances of political opinion. Parties alleging a grievance must be referred to a judicial body; and, if they fail to make good their case there by sheer argument, they will be unable to convince themselves or others that they suffer injustice because they have not yet made noise enough to gain the ear of Parliament.

This is, of course, only an illustration; but it is typical of a number of cases in which the interests of the four universities are essentially different; in which, therefore, disputes are not unlikely to arise; and it shows that *the Bill fails to provide any method of defining and bringing them to an issue.*

II. Let us glance at the question of Entrance Examinations, which the Executive Commission is expected to settle on a durable basis. Any one who carefully examines the conditions of the problem will admit that it is one of extreme difficulty and delicacy; and there is nothing extravagant in putting the supposition that



the scheme laid down by the commission may prove inadequate. Even if successful for a time, it would almost certainly require modification when the subject of secondary education in Scotland is taken up in earnest. Ordinary prudence bids us be prepared with some remedy in case of a breakdown. But the Bill provides none. It is true that the Courts of the four universities would be free to negotiate with each other (as the university authorities now are); but everybody knows with what difficulty the negotiations of four elected bodies would be conducted; and if one university declined to accede to a new arrangement, the failure would be complete. The case is selected as typical of many in which similarity and simultaneity of action by all the universities are essential to success; and it will be seen that *the Bill makes no provision for concerted action after the expiry of the Executive Commission.*

III. We take now the case of the Education of Women, which raises questions of a different order. The Executive Commission will have power to lay down regulations under which classes for women must be carried on, if at all; but it will be perfectly optional for any university to open such classes. If the purpose of the commission and of the Bill were merely to bring the universities up to date, it is probable that they would not be justified in going farther than this. But a Bill expressly designed for the future improvement of the universities must be judged more severely. Let us suppose that the question makes great advances, and that the university education of women comes to be generally recognized as a public duty. Let us suppose, also (what is at least possible), that in these circumstances one university determinedly lags behind. Wealthy people can migrate to other universities; but there is a large majority of persons in each quarter of Scotland who must have university education there or not at all. One university, then, fails to supply the wants of the people for whose instruction it is a trustee in receipt of public money. This case, again, is illustrative of many problems which will probably arise in the future; but *the Bill provides no power to enforce the performance of a public duty when the Court of any university is unwilling to perform it*; as, for example, the Railway Commission has jurisdiction to compel a company to run workmen's trains.

It will be urged that, at all events, the efficiency and the progressive improvement of the universities *singly* are amply secured by the composition of the new university Court. Strange that this argument is so often relied on by those who are never tired of denouncing the conservatism of university constituencies! It is the fact that, of the sixteen members of the new Court, not one will be popularly elected and responsible. It is a large assumption that the new Courts will keep abreast of average public opinion; and there is no likelihood that they will be generally in advance of

it. But that all four universities would move, independently but simultaneously, in sympathy with the best ideas of academic progress, is flatly incredible. What is wanted is a central rational organ, an authoritative tribunal, to test the varying currents of opinion on questions of academic policy, to judge between them purely on grounds of reasonable expediency, to secure uniform development where uniformity is desirable, and, if necessary, to force on a reluctant university the adoption of a wise reform.

IV. It is needless to point out how valuable would be the proposed Permanent Commission as a Court of Appeal from the decisions of the new University Court (or the remodelled Senate) in certain cases. For instance, in questions affecting character there is no reason to believe that the new Court (or Senate) will prove more efficient than the present Court, which, if an outsider may presume to judge, handles them exceeding gingerly. Nor need we enlarge on other actual and most perplexing problems—such as the appropriation of university revenues, the regulation of fees, salaries, and pensions, the future position of extra-mural teachers, the status and remuneration of assistants, the control of extension lectures or local examinations. The present argument is confined to general principles, and we desire to avoid expressing any opinion about the treatment of particular problems. But he must be a sanguine man who expects that on topics like these the Executive Commission will produce an era of widespread and lasting satisfaction. There are those whose simple faith in an Executive Commission is only equalled by their sublime confidence in future Parliaments. But what we find more astonishing than either is the apparent willingness of most critics of the Bill to believe that four independent and rival institutions, without umpire or superior, each of them governed by a body of men appointed to represent conflicting interests on the basis of the balance of power, will work alongside of each other smoothly, contentedly, and harmoniously for an indefinite time.

It would, of course, be an exaggeration to say that the Government scheme is ingeniously devised to keep the universities moving far in the rear of public opinion. But the Bill appears to be conceived under the predominating conviction that the State is strangely anxious to pay down their portions to trustees, and to cast her growing daughters loose, careless whither they may wander. It is time we faced the question—*After the Executive Commission, what?* This much is certain: the Privy Council Committee will have no power to originate movement or to direct it. Its sole function is to be a drag on the wheel. It may be useful in checking rash innovation or suspending immature proposals. But it cannot arbitrate between the universities in cases of conflict, nor will it exercise a constant elevating and harmonizing influence. Compare with this the large

powers which we suggest should be conferred upon a Permanent Commission : power to adjust disputes between different universities, and to investigate charges of preferential treatment ; power to impose on two or more universities new and identical regulations suited to altered circumstances ; and power, if necessary, to compel a university to be active in discharging its public responsibilities. Thus shall we indirectly forecast the future, and set up perpetual machinery for adapting the university system to the changing needs of coming years.

Whatever the future may bring forth, at present the existence of a conflict of interests is undeniable. The professorial party and the extra-mural party have long been with us, and we hear the muttering of the assistants and the grumbling of the students. Beyond these voices there may be peace. But not many take a broad view of the situation ; and the prevalence of vague and inconsistent ideals only proves that an immediate and final settlement is impracticable. Hence the necessity for relentlessly testing the proposals regarding means and machinery. If the general apathy on this perhaps repellent subject were overcome, the outlook would be clearer ; but it is impossible to look far ahead without some misgiving. The conduct of successive Governments resembles nothing so much as an egg-dance. Practical Logic cares little for party squabbles, save as means or hindrances to the attainment of its ends ; and other mental qualifications are necessary to a successful legislator than a good-natured desire to offend as few people as possible.

## SIKHIM AND THE THIBETAN QUESTION.

"COMMANDING, confessedly, the grandest known landscape of snowy mountains in the Himalayas and hence in the world," the view from Darjeeling is, writes Sir James Hooker,<sup>1</sup> unparalleled for the scenery it embraces. The snow-clad mass of Kinchinjunga, rising 21,000 feet above the level of the observer, out of a sea of intervening wooded hills, is only forty-five miles distant; "whilst, on a line with its snows, the eye descends below the horizon to a narrow gulf 7000 feet deep in the mountains where the Great Rungeet, white with foam, threads a tropical forest with a silver line. To the north-west, towards Nepaul, the snowy peaks of Kubra and Jummo (respectively 24,005 and 25,312 feet) rise over the shoulder of Singaleelah, whilst eastward the snowy mountains appear to form an unbroken range, trending north-east to the great mass of Donkia (23,176) and thence south-east to the fingered peaks of Tunkola and the silver cone of Chola, gradually sinking into the Bhootan Mountains at Gipmoochi (14,509)."—The view described is practically a view of Sikhim; and the picture brings vividly before us the little State which has suddenly sprung into notoriety as a recent battle-ground and prospective trade-route between India and Thibet. A tumbled mountain mass, made up of great heights and deep-cut ravines, of heavy forest and foaming torrent, in which rises and descents of six thousand feet and more are common in passing from valley to valley, sometimes in a single day's march, Sikhim fulfils the wildest conception of mountain grandeur. Kinchinjunga itself is within its borders: over Chola and Tunkola are the passes into Chumbi which our soldiers have lately traversed. The Snowy Range marks, in fact, roughly, the frontier of Thibet.

Hidden thus in the recesses of the Himalayas, screened from the lowland by our hill-station of Darjeeling, shrouded as it were in virgin forest, Sikhim is too small a political unit to have attracted notice outside of Hindostan. As a region possessing scenery of surpassing beauty and flora of luxuriant wealth, it has been explored by travellers like Sir James Hooker and Sir Richard Temple, who have given us fascinating descriptions of its natural beauty: as a

<sup>1</sup> *Himalayan Journals; or, Notes of a Naturalist*. By James Dalton Hooker. London. 1854.—There are within the field of view twelve mountains over 20,000 feet. The nearest snow is thirty-two miles, and the farthest seventy-three miles distant.

troublesome neighbour, it has had to be coerced by soldiers like Colonel Gawler, who has left a humorous picture of its physical difficulties : as a vassal State and a possible hyphen between India and Thibet, it has been visited by political officers like Mr. Edgar. But of history in the literary sense it has practically none ; for what there was of local record—a remarkable and beautiful manuscript kept in the monastery of Pemyongchi—was, we are told, destroyed by the Nepaulese in 1814. What little is known of its earlier story has been summarized by Captain Temple in the Introduction to his father's diaries.<sup>1</sup> Practically however, as he remarks, no European has even seriously inquired into it, nor is there much promise of valuable result if the task were undertaken. It is sufficient for us to know that the Rajah's family came originally from Thibet, and attained to princely rank, about three hundred years ago, in the person of one Penccho Namagé, who was then settled at Gantok. There had occurred in Thibet, not long previously, the great Tsong-Kaban reformation, which divided the Thibetan world as effectually as Luther divided European Christendom ; and many lamas of the older but defeated sect had migrated to Sikhim. These Penccho seems to have taken under his protection and, by their help, to have raised himself to the throne. The event has interest as illustrating the connection with Thibet which has been a dominant factor in Sikhimese polity, and deserves note for that reason ; but it is not till towards the close of the eighteenth century that Sikhim looms upon the Indian horizon—or that it begins, at any rate, to figure as an element in Anglo-Indian politics.

Sikhim is referred to as “Bramasejon” by Van de Putte, who gathered his information from a son of the Rajah then visiting the Court of Lhasa, and as “Demo-jong” by Bogle half a century later ; but neither of them crossed the frontier, nor does this nomenclature do much more than signalize its existence. Bogle learned, certainly, that there was a path across it between India and Thibet,<sup>2</sup> but no thought of utilizing it occurred, evidently, either to him or to Hastings. It was, in fact, closed at the moment by the same cause which was impelling them to seek a way through Bhootan. The Goorkhas, who had throttled by their exactions the traditional highway through Nepaul, had extended their conquest over the Sikhimese lowland and interfered, in this direction also, between India and Thibet. Bogle's references to Sikhim are, in fact, made only with regard to the anxiety caused by Goorkha turbulence. “There was,” exclaimed the Teshu Lama—and the sentence is worth quoting

<sup>1</sup> *Journals kept in Hyderabad, Kashmir, Sikhim, &c.* By Sir R. Temple. Edited by Captain R. C. Temple.

<sup>2</sup> The commodities of Bengal used to be conveyed into Thibet through the Murung (Sikhimese lowland) and a province adjoining to it which is subject to Lhasa and governed by a chief styled Demo-jong. The fakirs, when expelled from Nepaul, generally frequented this road ; but being esteemed unhealthy, it was not adopted by any creditable merchants.—*Narrative of the Mission of George Bogle to Thibet.*

as a declaration of suzerainty—"no trusting them; for though their Rajah had promised over and over again that he would never encroach a finger's breadth on Thibetan territory, he had now attacked Demojong's country which was subject to Lhasa."

Sikhim comprised, at that period, what may, for convenience of illustration, be described as three sections: (1) the Trans-nivean province of Chumbi, bounded on the north and east by Lhasa-Dé and Bhootan; (2) the region known as Cis-nivean Sikhim, bounded on the north and west by Lhasa-Dé and Nepaul; (3) the district of Darjeeling, including a tract at the foot of the Himalayas then known as the Murung. The first was, and is, admittedly Thibetan soil; the second has passed under the influence, and the third into the actual possession, of British India. Sikhim is, in fact, literally astride on a dividing range of the Himalayas, with one leg on the Thibetan and one on the Indian slope. It is from Cis-nivean Sikhim that we have been lately concerned to expel the Thibetan troops; and it is the passes leading from the Cis-nivean to the Trans-nivean province that we are anxious to open.

It would be worse than wearisome to follow, here, the tangled skein of local quarrel that began with the rise of Goorkha power and terminated only, in 1817, with our own appearance on the scene. We are concerned only with the incident which entailed the barring of the Thibetan frontier; and the fewest possible words will suffice to maintain the connection of the story.—Having subjugated Nepaul the Goorkhas were, as we have seen, at the time of Bogle's mission, threatening to extend their conquest over Sikhim. They had overrun the Murung, and were invading the hill region when a Thibetan army was sent to oppose them. The incident closed with their retreat from Sikhim proper, on certain terms which are irrelevant to our purpose, but in their retaining possession of the Murung, which figures thenceforth as a sort of counter in the game of Himalayan politics. They were, however, quieted only for the moment; they invaded, sixteen years later, the very territory of the Dalai Lama, and advanced as far as Shigatze which they took and sacked. The Chinese came to the assistance of their feudatories, drove back the invaders, and wound up the campaign by closing the southern frontier. Natives of Nepaul, Sikhim, and Bhootan continued to pass freely over the dividing range, but the way was barred against natives of Hindostan. "So careful were they," says Turner, whose narrative<sup>1</sup> forms the staple record of the event, "to avail themselves of every possible advantage within their reach, that they occupied an intermediate country between Bhootan and Nepaul, the territory of a petty chief denominated Rajah of Segwin, or Seccum [Sikhim] . . . and from this period, unhappily, is to be dated the interruption

<sup>1</sup> *An Account of an Embassy to the Court of the Teshoo Lama in Thibet, &c.* By Captain Samuel Turner. London. 1806.

which has taken place in the regular intercourse between the Company's possessions and the territory of the Lama." The "intermediate country" in question was the province of Chumbi, of which we have heard so much in connection with recent operations; and which is destined to so much prominence as a highway and possible *entrepôt* of Indo-Thibetan trade, that it may be worth while quoting Hooker's description of its characteristics:—

"Choombi is the general name given to a large Thibetan province that embraces the head of the Machoo river, and includes Phari, Eusa, Choombi, and about thirteen other villages, corresponding to as many districts that contain from under a dozen to three hundred houses each, varying with the season and state of trade. The latter is considerable, Phari being, next to Darjeeling, the greatest Thibetan, Bhotan, Sikhim, and Indian *entrepôt* along the whole Himalaya east of Nepaul. The general form of Choombi valley is triangular, the broader end northwards; it is bounded by the Chola Range on the west, from Donkia to Gipmoochi, and by the Kamphee or Chakoong range to the east. These meridional ranges approximate to the southward, so as to form a natural boundary to Choombi. The Machoo River, rising from Chumulari, flows through Choombi and enters Bhotan at a large mart called Rinchingoong, whence it flows to the plains of India. . . . The Choombi district is elevated, for the only cultivation is a summer or alpine one, neither maize, rice, nor millet being grown there: it is also dry, for the great height of the Bhotan Mountains and the form of the Machoo valley cut off the rains, and there is no dense forest: it is very mountainous, all carriage being on men's and yaks' backs; and is populous for this part of the country, the inhabitants being estimated at 3000 in the trading season. . . . From Choombi to Lhassa is fifteen long days' journey for a man mounted on a stout mule."

It is essential to the comprehension of recent events that the political and geographical distinction between the Cis-nivean and Trans-nivean provinces be clearly realized; and it may even be worth mentioning that, when Hooker succeeded in making a detour through Chumbi from the Kongralama to the Donkia Pass, "nothing would induce the Thibetan guard who accompanied him to cross into Cis-nivean Sikhim, which they regarded as Company's territory."

It was the British war with Nepaul in 1814 that led to the attraction of Sikhim within the sphere of Indian politics. The Rajah required little persuasion to array himself on our side against his predatory neighbours; but he suffered badly, at the outset, for his temerity. His troops were driven across the Teesta; the country was overrun, the monasteries were plundered, and that act of vandalism was committed which deprived the world for ever of a section of Himalayan history! However, we were of course victorious on the West; and the Rajah—partly as a reward, but mainly with a view of setting up Sikhim as a buffer between Nepaul and Bhootan—was taken (in 1817) under Indian protection, and replaced in possession of the vexed Murung region.

Fourteen years of tranquillity followed, but at the end of that period a fresh process of disintegration began. There broke out, in

1828, a frontier dispute between Sikhim and Nepaul which occasioned the visit to Darjeeling by Mr. J. W. Grant that resulted in its acquisition by the British. What is now a flourishing town was then a paltry village; what is now an important centre of tea and cinchona cultivation was then impenetrable jungle. But Mr. Grant was so impressed with its potential value as a sanatorium, a commercial depot, and if need be a military station, that he induced Lord William Bentinck to negotiate for its cession. There was a little delay in realizing the project, but the Rajah was eventually persuaded (in 1835) to yield the territory in exchange for a pension of £300.—For some years all went smoothly between the new settlement and the parent State; but a change for the worse ensued with the advent in Sikhim of a new Minister, who is described as a Thibetan of the worst Lama type. The institution of slavery, which seems common along the Thibetan border,<sup>1</sup> and the propensity for kidnapping British subjects from the plains, were at the root of the new trouble. But a crisis was caused by the seizure and imprisonment of Dr. Campbell, then Superintendent of Darjeeling, in the preposterous hope of obtaining, among other things, the rendition of certain runaways who had found refuge on British territory. The incident occurred while he was travelling with Dr. Hooker on one of those adventurous journeys to which we are indebted for the latter's graphic sketches; and we may perhaps stay here to give an impression, however slight, of the little State which has since assumed such unexpected importance.

Dr. Hooker was the first European to thoroughly explore and describe Sikhim. His steps have since been often trodden. Colonel Gawler has sketched for us the expedition of 1861, which occupied Tumloong and exacted the treaty designed to open up communication with Thibet; Mr. Edgar has described a visit paid by him to the Rajah in 1873; and Sir Richard Temple has given us a pleasing diary of excursions through British Sikhim in 1875. But for charm of description and comprehensive observation, the *Himalayan Journals* still hold the field. Hooker's main object was, of course, botanical research, but his narrative ranges widely beyond the flora which it was his special purpose to examine. A lover of Nature able to appreciate the magnificent scenery, and an observer capable of sketching a quaintly interesting people, he has given us a book of travel which is not only fascinating in itself but a valuable contribution to the geography of the Himalayan region.

Not the least curious feature in Sikhimese polity is the variety of races hemmed into Cis-nivean Sikhim. The most numerous as well as most attractive element is the Lepcha, which prevails south of the

<sup>1</sup> Captain Gill, for instance, writing of Bathang, on the Chinese frontier, says: "Slavery is a great institution. There are rich families who own 500 or 600 slaves. . . . A family always counts its riches in slaves and cattle."—*River of Golden Sand*, vol. ii. ch. v.



snowy range, and is most friendly to British rule; but there are also Limboos and Moormis on the side of Nepal; Thibetans, *pur sang*, in the regions bordering on Thibet; Bhootas, who have immigrated from Bhootan; Mechis, who dwell in the forest bordering on the plain; and Magras, who appear to be remnants of an aboriginal race displaced by the Lepchas, as the latter have been encroached on by the hardier races of Thibet and Bhootan. All except the Mechi, who is Indo-Chinese, are of markedly Mongolian origin, and all are impregnated, in a greater or less degree, with the religion and customs of Thibet, though all have languages and customs of their own; and it is, as Hooker remarks, not a little curious that six or seven different tribes should dwell in peace and unity, in such a confined territory, under a Sovereign whose temporal power is unsupported by even the semblance of force. It is probably the veneer of Buddhism and of Thibetan civilization which constitutes the cement; for even the Lepchas, who are the least affected by it, pay an implied reverence to the Lama creed. The Sikhimese belong to the "Red Cap" or unreformed sect, the Yellow-capped followers of Tsong Kaba, though in the ascendant in Thibet, having never made way on the southern slopes of the Himalayas. Buddhist temples are numerous, and a large number of the people seem to pass through a religious apprenticeship, spending a certain period in the monastery, and returning anon to cultivate the soil. The principal of these establishments is Pemyongchi; and the appreciation of natural beauty which has characterized the Religious of all ages seems to have pre-eminently influenced the selection of its site; for the view of the Snowy Range from it is, we are told, one of the finest in Sikhim, "the eye surveying at one glance the vegetation of the tropics and the poles. Deep in the valleys the river-beds are but 3000 feet above the sea, and are choked with fig-trees, plantains, and palms. To these succeed laurels and magnolias and, higher up still, oaks, birches, and chestnuts from 4000 to 10,000 feet. Pines succeed for 2000 feet higher, and give place to a skirting of rhododendrons and berbery," while high above all towers the giant height of Kinchinjunga, "the snow descending in one continuous sweep from 28,000 to a level of 15,000 feet, radiating from the summit along spur and shoulder for ten or fifteen miles towards each part of the compass." Nor does the building seem unworthy of the situation; the marvel, indeed, being how a people so poor can have managed to erect such a comparatively handsome structure. The ornamentation and characteristics are of course essentially Thibetan, "the square end of every beam being ornamented either with a lotus flower or Thibetan characters, while the walls are covered with allegorical paintings of lamas and saints expounding and in contemplation, with glories round their heads, mitred and holding the dorje and jewel."

While admitting, however, the Thibetan religion, the Sikhimese appear to have excluded some objectionable features of Thibetan

polity ; for polyandry, among the Lepchas at any rate, is declared to be unknown and polygamy rare. Mention has been already made of the attractive qualities of this curious people, and Hooker never tires of paying tribute to their kindness and good-humour. "A gloomy-tempered or morose master they avoid, an unkind one they flee ; but if they serve a good hill's-man like themselves, they will follow him with alacrity through every hardship, sleep on the cold bleak mountain exposed to the pitiless rain without a murmur, lay down their heavy burden to carry their master over a stream, or give him a helping hand up rock or precipice—do anything, in short, but encounter a foe : " for the Lepcha seems to be a veritable coward ; and it is perhaps this peaceful disposition which has preserved him from extinction at the hands of his hardier and more warlike neighbours. Their standard of civilization may be low, and their talents few ; but "they are conspicuous for their honesty, their power as carriers and mountaineers, and their skill as woodsmen ; for they build a waterproof house with a thatch of banana leaves in the lower, and of bamboo in the elevated, regions, and equip it with a table and bedsteads for three persons, in an hour, using no implement but their heavy knife."

Dr. Hooker seems indeed, on the whole, to have carried away a most pleasing impression of his temporary hosts. Trouble and hindrance he encountered, but they arose from the ill-will of the chief Minister or Dewan, and in no way from unkindliness in the people. There were times when he came near to starvation, but never through the indisposition of his neighbours ; there were times when the locality was so poor that they had not food to give, and times when they dared not, or dared only surreptitiously, sell what they had ; but hospitality and kindness seem to have been the prevailing characteristics when the neighbourhood was fertile and circumstances were propitious. Presents<sup>1</sup> of fruit, fowls and eggs, rice, butter, and beer seem, indeed, to have poured in at times with inconvenient profusion.

The *Journals* are full of characteristic touches portraying the manners and customs of the people, their dress, houses, and pursuits, as vividly as their physical surroundings. Here, for instance, is an interview with the Rajah, which gives us at a glance an estimate of Sikkhimese civilization at its best :—

"A roofed shed of neat bamboo wattle, about 20 feet long. Two Bhootas, with scarlet jackets, and with bows in their hands, stood on each side of the door, and our chairs were carried before us for our accommodation. Within was a wicker throne 6 feet high, covered with purple silk, brocaded with dragons in white and gold, and overhung by a canopy of tattered blue silk, with which material part of the wall was also covered. An oblong box containing papers, with golden dragons on it, was placed on the stage

<sup>1</sup> The following, sent on one occasion by the Rajah, may serve as a typical and comprehensive catalogue :—A brick of Thibet tea ; 80 lbs. of yak butter, done up in yak-hair cloth ; 3 loads of rice, and 1 load of murwa for beer ; rolls of Thibetan bread ; fowls, eggs, dried plums, apricots, jujubes, currants, and sultana raisins (purchased at Lhasa, but imported from N.W. Thibet), and some trays of coarse white salt dug in Thibet.

or throne, and behind it was perched, cross-legged, an odd, black, insignificant-looking old man with twinkling, upturned eyes. He was swathed in yellow silk, and wore on his head a pink silk hat with a flat broad crown, from all sides of which hung floss silk. This was the Rajah, a genuine Thibetan, about seventy years old."

And here is a village high up in the Himalayas (11,480 feet), close on the Thibetan frontier, which introduces us to the opposite extreme:—

"The village of Tallum consists of a few wretched stone huts, placed in a broad part of the valley, which is swampy and crossed by several ancient moraines. . . . The cottages are from 4 to 6 feet high, without windows, and consist of a single apartment containing neither table, chair, stool, nor bed; the inmates huddle together amid smoke, filth, and darkness, and sleep on a plank; and their only utensils are a bamboo churn, copper bamboo and earthenware vessels for milk, butter, &c."

Dr. Hooker's first journey occupied the winter of 1848-9, and resulted in a magnificent botanical collection comprising, among other trophies, the Himalayan rhododendrons which were afterwards planted at Kew. Not, however, yet content he started again in the autumn of 1849, and was joined by Dr. Campbell, who wished to see the Rajah about various causes of difference. The description of this journey introduces us to fresh delights and fresh drawbacks of Himalayan travel. The travellers see false sunsets in the eastern sky; they encounter glaciers and hot springs—in one of which a coolie, who had gone back to look for a thermometer he had dropped, elected to pass the night as a comfortable refuge! A vagrant Thibetan, who "gained a livelihood by going up and down the country blessing, cursing, and doing other such necessary business," dances for alms. They meet with scenery that defies description, and cold that is almost intolerable. Eventually, however, they reach Tumloong, the capital of Cis-nivean Sikhim, and opportunities are afforded of sharing the hospitality and observing the life of the people by which the *Journals* largely profit. Allusion has been made to the ethnic and political kinship between Sikhim and Thibet, and the likeness extends to dress and manners. Here, for instance, is a cameo of a lady which may serve as a comparison to the picture of the Rajah on a former page. Dr. Hooker is at Tumloong, and approaches

"a concourse of women dressed in their pretty striped and crossed cloaks who had brought tokens of good will. Amongst them . . . conspicuous from large necklaces of amber (in lumps the size of a fist) corals, and silver flagree work, with which her neck and shoulders were loaded. She wore on her head a red tiara, bedizened with seed pearls and large turquoises, and a gold fillet of flagree bosses united by a web of slender chains. Her hair (plaited in long tails) was elaborately woven with beads, and her cloak hooked in front by a chain of broad silver links studded with turquoises. White silk scarves, the emblems of peace and friendship, were thrown over our heads by each party; and rice, eggs, kids, goats, and murwa beer poured in apace, to the great delight of our servants."

Amber, pearls, coral, and turquoises seem to be the favourite ornaments in Thibet. Gill and Bogle have given us similar sketches of the women of Bathang and Lhasa-Dé; and a picture of the mother of the Teshu Lama, drawn for us by Turner, is simply an enlarged photograph of the Sikhimese lady just described. Whether, in fact, the pages before us be Gill's, Huc's, Turner's, or Hooker's; whether the locale be the Chinese frontier or the city of Lhasa, Bhootan, Teshu Lumbo, or the capital of Sikhim, we are met by the same peculiarities. An oratory at Tumloong is adorned with paintings by Lhasa artists. A colony of Thibetans, who have come to pasture their cattle near Kinchinojw, display the "butter ornaments" made familiar to us by Huc. Lamas, turquoises, coral, amber, tsanba,<sup>1</sup> khatas, and profuse hospitality meet us at every turn. The difficulty is, where customs are strange, to convey in a few words the import of the comparisons they suggest. Nothing short of parallel quotations from the several writers named would adequately meet the case, and such elaborate reproduction is evidently impossible within the limits of a Review. Dr. Hooker's last picture however, introduces us to a custom so peculiar and so widely prevalent that we are tempted to seize on it as an individual illustration. Nothing in the whole range of Thibetan etiquette is more curious than the khata, or "scarf of felicity," which flutters perpetually before our eyes. We have just seen white scarves thrown over the heads of Dr. Hooker and his party by his Sikhimese hosts. Turner exchanges khatas at every turn during his journey through Bhootan, and makes memoranda to investigate their import—which fail in their purpose, but leave him still more impressed by the custom. On the occasion of Bogle's farewell to the Teshu Lama, the latter "throws a handkerchief about his neck;" and readers may remember the meeting with the Deb Patza and his wife, when Bogle "is so taken up in getting a handkerchief ready for the former that he does not observe the lady till she is passed," notwithstanding which the Deb "courteously declined to receive my handkerchief till he had given me his." A few dozen khatas were among the purchases Captain Gill found it necessary to make before setting out from Tatsienloo; and he mentions, among their uses, that "pious people visiting a lamaserai generally tie one on the rails in front of the image of Buddha"—a cognate ceremony to that which Turner underwent on quitting Teshu Lumbo, when he "bound a white scarf round the capitals of each of the four columns that

<sup>1</sup> Barley-meal mixed in tea. The Thibetans habitually put butter and salt (or soda) in their tea; adding barley-meal to make a repast. A correspondent of the *Calcutta Englishman* draws an amusingly wry face at the tea (mixed with butter and salt) offered him on the occasion of a recent visit to the Rajah of Sikhim. Huc speaks of *tea and meal* (tsanba) as the customary food of the Thibetan people. "If one will traverse the desert and reach Lhasa, one must resign oneself to eating tsanba." In every house entered by Captain Gill in the marches of Szechuen, "butter, cheese, and tsanba were immediately forthcoming"!

stood within the apartment he had occupied." So universal, indeed, is the custom, so all-pervading the part the khata plays in Thibetan etiquette, that we have recourse to Huc for a full description of its uses. The khata or scarf of felicity is, he tells us, "a piece of silk whose fineness approaches that of gauze. Its colour is white with an azure tint. Its length is about three times its breadth; and the two extremities end usually in fringe. There are khatas of all sizes and prices, for it is an object with which neither rich nor poor can dispense. No one ever sets out without carrying a provision of them. When one goes to pay a visit of etiquette, when one wishes to ask a service or express thanks for one rendered, one begins by displaying a khata. One takes it in both hands, and offers it to the person one wishes to honour. If two friends who have not seen each other for some time chance to meet, their first care is to offer each other a khata. That is done with as much *empressement* and as quickly as in Europe one shakes hands. It is customary also, in writing, to enclose, among letter a little khata. One would hardly believe it were afterwards Thibetans, the Si Fan, and all the peoples wh. he started again inst of the Blue Sea attach to the ceremony of the mobell, "For them it is the purest and most sincere expression of all noble sentiments. The finest words, the most magnificent presents, are nothing without the khata. With it, on the contrary, the commonest objects acquire an immense value. To refuse a favour asked for, khata in hand, would be to express contempt for all proprieties."—Such is the Abbé's sparkling description of this all-pervading custom, which seems as prevalent on the slopes of the Himalayas as on the borders of Szechuen, on the shores of Koko-Nor as in the capital of the Dalai Lama: and Mr. Colborne Baber even tells us that there is found, in the forest land bordering on China, a kind of moss growing pendent on the trees somewhat in the shape of a scarf, which the Thibetans call "fairy khata."

It is useless to multiply illustrations. Enough has been said to show that, in almost every sense, the affinities of the Sikhimese are for the Thibetans, and not for the inhabitants of Hindostan. Nowhere in the world, probably, can a sharp line be drawn, and affligation made that there exist, on either side, distinct races of different types, instincts, and religion; but nowhere probably could such a line be drawn with greater approach to accuracy than in this region. What Turner writes of Bhootan is true approximately of Sikhim: "So wide a difference is evident between them and their neighbours of Bengal that, were a stranger to both desired to give an opinion of them when placed together, he would not hesitate to pronounce them natives of regions the remotest from each other, and would never suppose that they belonged to a contiguous soil."

It is time, however, to turn from these glimpses of Himalayan life, and resume our *aperçu* of the political situation. We had

declared a protectorate over Sikhim in 1817, with a view of setting bounds to the extension of Goorkha power; we had acquired Darjeeling in 1835, both as a sanatorium and as a *place d'armes* in case it became necessary to affirm the position taken up. The time was now approaching when the fact of British ascendancy and the situation of Sikhim in a direct line between Calcutta and Lhasa, were to suggest its adaptability as a highway for trade between the two regions.

We left Dr. Campbell intent on visiting the Rajah with a view to improve, if possible, our relations with Tumloong, but under the shadow of an outrage that was to provoke a diametrically opposite result. Affairs began badly, with a misunderstanding that might have been avoided by a clearer appreciation of Thibetan etiquette. Campbell seems to have been huffed because he was not at once received in audience. As a matter of fact, however, it is the short time for that matter Chinese—custom to leave the visitor adequately met with by hurrying him with visits. Bogle and Turner introduce us to experience, in Bhootan and Thibet, and were impressed by the consideration that allows a guest this repose on his arrival from a journey. Dr. Campbell, however, impatient of delay, set out with his companion on an excursion to the frontier. Their purpose had been to make a detour through Chumbi, but they were stopped at Chola by the Thibetan guard, and had retired to Chumanako, when suddenly, without warning, Campbell was knocked down and pinioned by the Sikhimese escort. There seems no necessary connection between the two incidents. One was a misunderstanding; the other, apparently, an act of political pressure. For there was, Dr. Hooker was assured, no complaint or ill-feeling against himself; he was free to travel where he chose; the animus was against Campbell, who would be held in durance at Tumloong till the Governor-General confirmed certain articles which he would be required to subscribe! To seize the representative of a neighbouring State, and confine him till he should become amenable, seems in fact a recognized practice in the border region; and it is illustrative of a difficulty others than Sikhimese occasionally experience, in viewing matters from other than an habitual standpoint, that Hooker descanted in vain on the immorality of the proceeding.

Still, though consonant possibly with Himalayan law, the arrest seems to have appeared, even to the Sikhimese, of questionable taste; and was attributed by the victims to the sole influence of the Dewan and his clique. The aged abbot of Pemyongchi came in person to remonstrate; a certain Cheboo Lama, who played afterwards a conspicuous part in Himalayan politics, was loyal in his friendship; and a vehement protest from Lord Dalhousie seems at last to have carried conviction that the arrest would not be considered, at

Calcutta, the every-day incident it appeared at Tumloong. It was determined, accordingly, to restore the hostages without awaiting fulfilment of the conditions. But so obtuse, to the last, did the Dewan seem to the enormity of the wrong, that he actually set out for Darjeeling with them in custody, taking merchandise and ponies for sale at Titalyah as though nothing had happened! Even his courage, however, oozed away as Darjeeling was neared; and he eventually let his prisoners go, halting himself on the north of the frontier.

It is significant of the progress since made in our conception of mountain warfare, that the General commanding at Darjeeling feared to venture on a punitive expedition. Troops were collected at Darjeeling; but even Sir Charles Napier was afraid to leave them, lest a Thibetan army should be summoned and they overwhelmed in the mountains! Other means of Europe unfortunately, were at hand. The Rajah's pension among Sikhim south of the Rungeet was annexed, and he afterwards the Dewan was secured by this pressure, he started again, but however, imperfect, and failed in ultimate result. For them it was so impoverished that we were obliged to noble sentiments. the Dewan regained his former influence; and renewed without compelled the adoption, ten years later, of the measures acquire Sir Charles Napier had shrunk. in hand,

The propensity for kidnapping—that prolific trouble—was at the root of the new difficulty. Such is the custom, which seems were periodically carried off; our demands, as on the borders of effect; and the Government of India decreed the capital of the Dalai Rinchipoong—a district lying between that there is found, in Rungeet—as a means of pressure. The occasions growing pendent Captain Murray and a body of native sapper, which the Thibetans but they were attacked, three weeks later, by Thibetans and Bhootas and obliged to retreat in been said to task had been undertaken with inadequate means and, care for warning and goodwill of the Lepchas, might have resulted in worse disaster.—This brought matters to a climax, and it was decided to send an expedition which should persuade the Court, once for all, of the necessity for submission. The command was given to Colonel Gawler, who has left us a graphic description<sup>1</sup> of the difficulties of the march—for it turned out to be a promenade only. There had been great preparations, but they were put to little use; there were numerous breastworks, but they were vacated on our approach; the Dewan had even tried to enlist Bhootanese help, but either his heart or his allies seem to have failed him at the pinch. Tumloong was reached practically without fighting; and a treaty was imposed

<sup>1</sup> *Sikhim: With Hints on Jungle and Mountain Warfare.* By Colonel Gawler. London: 1873.

which had, for one object, the facilitation of trade between India and Thibet. The Government had been slow in concentrating its purpose, but the decision was at last taken, and the following clauses gave expression to the project :—

“(11) On all goods passing into or out of Thibet, Bhootan, or Nepaul, the Government of Sikhim may levy a duty [not to exceed 5 per cent. *ad valorem*], when a pass shall be given exempting such goods from any further liability.

“(13) In the event of the British Government desiring to open out a road through Sikhim, with the view of encouraging trade, the Sikhim Government will raise no objection thereto, and will afford every protection and aid to the party engaged in the work. If the road is constructed, the Government of Sikhim undertakes to keep it in repair.”

Campbell and 19 bind the Rajah to refrain from hostilities against arrived in aucties; to submit disputes to British arbitration, and short for that of his territory without our assent; while adequately meet the that “the whole military force of Sikhim impossible within the liarry that “no armed force belonging to any introduced us t xpaid and facility to British troops when impressed by the consid that “no armed force belonging to any arrival from a pass through Sikhim without the sanction of the set out with nment.” Suzerainty could not well be more emphatic purpose had; nor could an agreement be more hopelessly and help were stoppe than these two clauses have been broken during recent Chumanako, whch the punitive and precautionary stipulations—down and pinioned currence of disorder, and affirming rights of necessary connection bet not now concerned. Suffice it to say that understanding: the other Since 1861 the Sikhimese have been on For there was, Dr. Hool e

against himself; he wa ears, the matter again rested. The road was against Campbell 13 was promptly made, from Darjeeling to till the Governor- trade grew in response to the facilities offered; be required to od on solely by hill-men, the frontier being closed as bouring S'ever against natives of the plain. It was not till 1873 that a willingness was shown to reknit the threads of Hastings' policy, and recover the privilege of access to Thibet which Bogle and Turner had laboured to obtain. Early in that year, Dr. Campbell and Colonel Gawler—the two men who had had, probably, most to do with establishing British influence in Sikhim—presented to the Secretary of State a memorandum summarizing the position, and urging upon him the opportuneness of a new departure. The population was friendly: Sikhim offered the shortest and most direct route between Lhassa and British territory: the Chola Pass was open nearly all the year round; and Chumbi, a large market town whence there is a good road to Lhassa, is only three hours' journey from the frontier. By a branch extension of the East Indian Railway to the foot of the Darjeeling hills, the transport of Indian and



English goods intended for Thibet, as well as our Darjeeling tea trade, would be greatly facilitated. The head of the Sikhimese religion, moreover, was in Thibet. Many of the officials were Thibetans, and the Rajah himself received a salary from Thibet, and spent half his time at Chumbi within the Thibetan frontier. With the advantages here enumerated, there could, it was suggested, be no great difficulty in establishing a consular agency at Chumbi to begin with, and eventually sending an envoy to Lhasa.

Whatever share it may have had in producing the result of this document coincides remarkably with a conception in the direction indicated. The old Rajah had late in the summer of 1873 the new Rajah visited Sir George Campbell in the Darjeeling: in the autumn of that year his perajy died. In the and Mr. Edgar paid him a return visit at which the question of opening up intercourse with Thibet was seriously discussed. permission to enter Chumbi, Mr. Edgar. it was increased visited at Chola not only by the Rajah and the very ex-Dewan Namgay—the hero of 1849, and of his repulse in 1860—who no chief Minister, bin to further our projects. There would be a unanimity in singular contrast to the ever renewed Thibet. It was China which had sealed the khata upon China to reopen them. The Emperor's situation.—Twelve more years were to be taken to approach the Chinese Government. But two important steps had been gained: the railway suggested by Messrs. Campbell completed to the foot of the Himalayas, and the Convention of Chefoo, recognizing the purpose of Englishmen to travel between India and China through Thibet.

The story merges henceforth into that of the Macaulay Mission, and in the larger field of Indo-Chinese policy. It would carry us beyond our purpose to enter here on a review of that project, or of the unfortunate misunderstanding to which it gave rise. We have been concerned rather to examine a small place of Sikhim in the controversy, and to throw such light on the subject as might serve to illustrate the situation. We have seen a little State disclosed (circa 1730) by Van De Putte—the first European who ever completed the journey from India through Lhasa to China; and we have seen the Rajah defended (in 1775) as a feudatory of the Dalai Lama, against the aggression of Nepal. We have seen how the hindrance of the old trade route through Nepal, after the Goorkha conquest of the country in 1763, led Hastings to seek an alternative way through Bhootan. We have seen Sikhim indicated by Bogle

<sup>1</sup> *Report on a Visit to Sikhim and the Thibetan Frontier.* By C. S. I. Calcutta. 1874.

bye-lane between India and Thibet, of no great account owing to malaria and other causes; and we have seen its passes closed, in common with the whole Thibetan frontier, by the Chinese, in 1792. We have followed the development of British influence, from its inception, in 1817, to the acquisition of Darjeeling in 1835, the annexation of the Nepaul in 1849, and the emphatic assertion of Indian suzerainty in 1861. And we have traced the project of opening up Sikkim as a highway between India and Thibet, from the first conception of the idea, down to the Macaulay Mission and the incidents to which it has given rise. If the hostile attitude of the Lamas involve a contradiction of the hopes we had been led to entertain, Sikkimese history may perhaps help us to a solution of the puzzle. We have seen Dr. Campbell arrested by the official clique in opposition to the popular wish; and we have seen the Lepchas warning him beforehand, and screening him after the attack at Rinchi-poong, in defiance of the policy of their officials. The surmise might not be very wide if we have, here, an index to the situation in Thibet—a hostile Lama officials disposing of the State forces in opposition to the wish of a singularly submissive people. Nothing surprising passed before Hooker more than the submission of the Sikkimese to British rule, and oppression of which the Dewan Namgay was; nor could his unpopularity was evident; he disposed of no resources than these and nothing could, it seemed to the visitor, have been. With the British overthrow him. Yet the people submitted, and went against a recurrence as they appear to submit in Thibet to the oppressive travel—we are in.

These were effectual. They past enable us also to appreciate more clearly the rival our. Thibetan and Indian suzerainty, over which the negotiations at Yezatong made temporary shipwreck. There never yet was a question that had not two sides; and rarely has there been one more fertile than this in material for disagreement. If it is obvious, from the foregoing pages, that the Lamas are justified in regarding Sikkim as an ancient dependency of Lhasa, it is equally clear that the Cis-nivean region has passed really under the influence of Calcutta. Bound by the treaty of Tumloong to join, with his whole force, any British troops engaged in the Himalayas, the Rajah is bound by treaty to guard the very passes we have been seeking to open. If there is one province in respect to which he is a pensioned feudatory of India, there is another in respect to which he is a subsidized dependent of Lhasa. Owing his very possession of Cis-nivean Sikkim to British protection, he is bound by race, tradition, and nearly by natural affinity to the Power which is arrayed against his real whence. It is not, however, the first time in history that political on the frontier clashed with the doctrine of nationality; and it will seem to many that the question was one for judicious avoidance.

"Devant ces suzerainetés-là," said a French writer *à propos* of Chinese claims in Tongking, "on salue et on passe." Would it not have been possible to let the Rajah continue making obeisance towards the North or towards the South, as occasion might demand? But the question was, it must be admitted, difficult to ignore. It is in virtue of our political supremacy that we have been able to carry our approaches through Sikhim to the very threshold of Thibet. To let pass, even tacitly, the Lama claim, would be to abandon this vantage ground, and to abandon the very road which the treaty of 1861 enabled us to construct. Both by treaty and in practice, Cis-nivean Sikhim has, since 1817, passed under the influence of India, and the Government of India may well have thought it necessary to obtain a recognition of existing facts.

We encountered, therefore, a Sikhimese question in addition to a Thibetan question; a question of suzerainty in addition to a question of intercourse; an excited and hostile clique instead of a friendly and commerce-loving people. Nor will an appreciation of these difficulties exclude the thought that they might have been conjured by a more careful study of the problem. There have been mistakes from the beginning. The constitution of the Macaulay Mission was a mistake: the *éclat* given to it was a mistake. The furious alarm of the Thibetans and their advance into Sikhim were mistakes—mistakes both stupid and deplorable, but less incomprehensible than might have been the case if history were not at hand to suggest an explanation. Precedent may be a bad master, but it is a valuable ally, and can certainly not be ignored in dealing with the "unchanging East." It was by quiet and unostentatious perseverance that Bogle succeeded in reaching Shigatze and opening up the relations which ensured a welcome to his successor; but it is a curious instance of the rapidity with which precedent is crystallized, that Turner was required to follow exactly in Bogle's footsteps. Bogle had come with an unpretentious retinue and a single European colleague; and this became henceforth, in Thibetan eyes, the standard for future missions. When Turner came, ten years later, to open wider the door that had been set ajar, he took with him two Europeans; but one (Mr. Davis) was turned back at the Thibetan frontier! So frankly was the precedent of Bogle's mission accepted, that it was taken for granted the Teshu Lama, in his new incarnation,<sup>1</sup> would follow the policy of his previous embodiment. But the precedent was two-edged. Two Europeans only had come before: two might come again; but three was an innovation! And Turner wisely submitted: his object was to get through. And it is far from unlikely that attention to this precedent might have ensured for Mr. Macaulay similar success. Thanks in no small degree to the good offices of the Marquis Tseng, the way had been smoothed for him at Peking; and he was promised the help of

<sup>1</sup> The Teshu Lama of Bogle's day had died in the interval, and had just been rediscovered, in the body of an infant, at the time of Turner's visit.

China both in opening the passes and in regulating the conditions of commercial intercourse. If he had gone quietly to the Thibetan frontier, with a single companion and an unostentatious retinue, it is far from unlikely that he might have found the barriers lowered. But instead of one European, Mr. Macaulay collected eight; and instead of a few servants, there was assembled at Darjeeling a retinue of several hundred persons, whose numbers were exaggerated, no doubt, still further, as rumour travelled towards the Lama capital.<sup>1</sup> Nor, even yet, is the comparison ended. Report says that the Thibetans were so far faithful to the precedent established in Hastings' day, that they approached Mr. Macaulay while he was still at Darjeeling with an offer to allow commercial intercourse at Shigatze, the capital of the Teshu Lama; and, if that report is true, an explanation of the failure to clasp hands on the proposal will be awaited with some interest. What we want is to get through the passes—liberty to trade on Thibetan soil, where commerce cannot be throttled as it is under present conditions; and this concession, if really offered, would surely have met the case.

It is, we repeat, beyond our purpose to review the story of recent negotiations, and the regrettable misunderstandings which ensued. The incursion of Thibetan troops, and their eventual expulsion from Cis-nivean Sikhim are matters of current history. But the thought occurs that, here again, we have neglected an axiom of Oriental policy. If it was essentially a case for being wary about entering into a quarrel, it was doubly necessary to remember the second half of the maxim. It may have been wise, after garrisoning Gnatong, to give time for every effort of diplomacy to avert further collision; but when once we had acted, when once we had driven the Thibetans through the passes, we should have remained in Chumbi. Our retreat was dictated, no doubt, by the best possible intention. What we thought to do was to prove to China and Thibet the reluctance with which we had fought, and the absence of any purpose of aggression. What we succeeded in doing was, more probably, to persuade the Lamas that we were afraid to pursue our advantage, and to encourage them to stand firm. The effect of our advance was immediately obvious in an announcement from Lhasa that the Chinese Resident was starting for the frontier; the effect of our withdrawal was made equally manifest by the delay in his arrival, and the reports of Lama opposition to his start. Assuming, as there is every reason to assume, that the Chinese Government is sincere, the presence of our troops in Chumbi would have facilitated an understanding. For the Chinese Amban, it must be remembered, is by no means all-powerful in Thibet. He is

<sup>1</sup> It is said that the incidental despatch to Darjeeling of a mule battery brought the alarm of the Thibetans to a climax. The movement had, as a matter of fact, no reference whatever to the Mission; but report reached Lhasa that the battery was to accompany it; and this decided the Lamas to occupy Sikhim!

supported more by the prestige than by the force of China, and is probably as unable as he may be unwilling to make concessions which there seems a chance of being able to resist. The presence of our troops actually beyond the passes, and with the way open to them into the interior of Thibet, would have strengthened his hand as Amban and have subdued, perhaps, his own inclination to bounce as a Chinese mandarin. To retreat was to remove that influence; and Lama obstinacy revived at once, like a spring from which pressure is withdrawn. The demand of India, that the Thibetans should undertake to respect Cis-nivean Sikhim, was met by an assertion of Chinese (*qua* Thibetan) suzerainty; and so acute did the wrangle become, over this unfortunate question, that the envoy was on the point of returning to Lhasa, and did actually withdraw into Chumbi, leaving the negotiations in the air.

Chinese goodwill has not, it must be confessed, done much, so far, to help forward our project; but there is reason to believe that it is power rather than goodwill which is lacking. And it is possible, on this supposition, that a further application of force on our part may be necessary to precipitate a solution. For it is a fatality in Oriental politics that one must go through with an undertaking once begun. Having required that Sikhim should be vacated, we had to drive the Thibetans out: having required that the Jelep pass should be cleared, we had to clear it: having asserted a protectorate over Cis-nivean Sikhim, we shall have to maintain it; and we shall be wise if we insist, once for all, that there is no more closing of the passes we have been at such pains to open. It would be indiscreet, probably, in the present state of Thibetan feeling, to ask for the immediate reception of a mission, or even for commercial access to the capital of the Dalai Lama. The situation is essentially one for compromise; and terms of compromise suggest themselves in the course of this review. A British consul in Chumbi, and the right to trade in Chumbi, might satisfy for the moment the exigencies of the situation. The important object is to get the door ajar; we want to get through the passes, and Chumbi lies beyond them. Ulterior advance might be vaguely indicated for subsequent arrangement; but an important step would be gained if an agreement were had that Indians and Thibetans should meet and trade in Chumbi as on neutral soil. The question of suzerainty seems one of those to which the Alexandrian method can be best applied; and the dividing range between the Cis- and Trans-nivean region suggests clearly where the cut should be made. All Sikhim on the hither side of the passes has been drawn under the ægis of India, while Chumbi has remained as completely under the influence of Thibet. The Jamas must recognize accomplished facts.

R. S. GUNDRY.

## INDEPENDENT SECTION.

*Under the above title a limited portion of THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW is occasionally set apart for the reception of able Articles, which, though harmonizing with the general spirit and aims of the Review, may contain opinions at variance with the particular ideas or measures it advocates. The object of the Editors in introducing this department is to facilitate the expression of opinion by men of high mental power and culture, who, while they are zealous friends of freedom and progress, yet differ widely, on special points of great practical concern, both from the Editors and from each other.]*

### AMERICA'S NEW PRESIDENT: WHY AND HOW HE WAS ELECTED.

THE decisive defeat of President Cleveland came upon the British public, and also upon the majority of his own countrymen, as a surprise. Here, at all events, while it was believed that the contest would be a close one, Mr. Cleveland's re-election by a small majority was regarded almost as a foregone conclusion; and even in the United States the prevailing opinion was to the same effect. The Democrats from the very first were exceedingly confident in their tone, and it was easy to see that the Republicans, although they put on a good deal of assurance, were at heart fearful as to what the sixth of November might bring forth. Yet the Republicans have won not only a victory but a triumph, and the Democrats have been overtaken, temporarily at least, not only by defeat, but by something like disaster. The calculations which were made, and the hopes which were cherished, with regard to this election have been completely falsified. How is this? What are the causes which have produced this remarkable revolution of the wheel of fortune? This is a question of some moment to the British people, who probably never before took so deep an interest in a Presidential election as they did in that which has recently taken place. Yet the question is involved in considerable mystery. American politics are so complicated that a clear and comprehensive grasp of them can only be obtained by studying them on the spot, and anything like a complete statement in regard to them involves so much detail that it is not very surprising that even our best

newspapers give us such meagre information on a subject of such importance. As I was in the United States during the three months which covered the most active portion of the campaign, and as I took great pains to acquaint myself with the whole of the facts, I may, perhaps, without presumption claim to be able to throw some light on this matter. My American critics will, I fear, make it a complaint against me that I have got to know rather too much.

It must, in the first place, be admitted that Mr. Cleveland was largely responsible for his own defeat. Reference is not here made to his Message on Tariff Revision, nor to his Message on Retaliation against Canada, nor to his impulsive and undignified action with regard to the dismissal of Lord Sackville; for the two latter steps undoubtedly helped him rather than otherwise with the American electors; while even his attitude on the Tariff question won him a largely increased vote in the manufacturing centre. But his alleged pro-English proclivities, his return of possible, federate colours to the South, his action in voting on our part of Pension Bills, and his somewhat boastful announcement in he was sure to win because he was a 'man of destiny'—all these things alienated from him thousands of votes. They are but petty and paltry matters, it is true, unworthy to have attached to them a feather's weight in such a critical contest as this was; but then it is the curse of the politics of the United States that they are dominated and degraded by just such contemptible trifles. It is beyond doubt that thousands of genuine Americans, and not simply the American Irish, voted against Cleveland because he was believed to command the sympathy of the English people. They voted so much vote for Harrison as against England. Only one for believe that this anti-British feeling was the weight and the right to case. Over and above this, however, though there was a belief that Mr. Cleveland had the exigencies of pledges as regards Civil Service reform, and that his door ajar; we had been too extravagant. Moreover, at the beginning of his term of office he somewhat ostentatiously announced that he should not seek re-election, and declared on general principles that it was inexpedient to elect a President for a second term. As President Mr. Cleveland was a political accident. An obscure man (probably Garfield, his immediate predecessor, did not even know of his existence), he made a good run for the Governorship of New York, after serving as sheriff of his county, and the caucus managers thought he would make a good run for the Presidency. They were right. But Mr. Cleveland was not selected as the candidate of his party for the Presidency because he was the fittest man on the Democratic side; he was simply a product of the Caucus system. He will now relapse into his former obscurity, and the English

people cannot regret this, for, although they were in sympathy with the economic policy which he represented, his action on the Canadian Fishery and the Sackville questions was such as to forfeit the regard which he had won in this country by his general course of conduct.

Mr. Benjamin Harrison, prior to his nomination by the Republican Convention at Chicago, was almost as obscure as Mr. Grover Cleveland had been. It is true that he had been a Brigadier-General during the war, and also for six years a member of Congress, but it is equally true that until he was nominated for the Presidency the bulk of his countrymen were ignorant of his existence. This was a negative recommendation of great value, for where very little is known about a man's past career even his worst enemies will find it difficult to make much of a case against him on the ground of his record. Mr. Harrison had not been Governor of any State; he had rendered no great political services to his country; not even

his admirers have ever claimed that he was the leader of a party, or even a man of extraordinary influence in councils; but on these very grounds it was impossible for Mr.

Harrison's candidature to evoke such bitter antagonism as was evoked by Mr. Blaine's four years ago, or as would have been excited by the nomination of General Sherman, General Alger, or Mr. Chauncey Depew. On the ground of his obscurity, therefore, and also on the further ground that he happened to live in Indiana—a doubtful State—Mr. Harrison was preferred to others. Mr. Blaine's character and career were so well-known that when he was nominated as the major Republican candidate for the Presidency, thousands of Republicans in the Grand and either abstained from voting or voted for Mr. Cleveland. The Democratic Republican caucus was so anxious to avoid the mistake their tone, and it was so notorious that they went to the they put on a good show. But, on the whole, it would appear that Mr. Harrison, what the sixth of the United States, is quite as much a publican as Mr. Cleveland was.

Mr. Harrison had, however, another advantage over Mr. Cleveland—he had a grandfather—and a great-grandfather as well. The latter was one of the signatories of the Declaration of Independence, while the former fought the battle of Tippecanoe, and was for one month President of the United States. Mr. Harrison owed a great deal to the lustre which was reflected upon him from the renown of these ancestors. The Americans laugh at our way of recognizing hereditary position and worth; but they repeat our folly in another form. What, for example, had Mr. Benjamin Harrison to do with the battle of Tippecanoe? Because his father gained a victory in a trumpery battle with some Indians, did it follow that he was more fitted to be President of the United States than Grover Cleveland? Assuredly not. And yet in all the Republican speeches and cam-



paigned songs a great deal more was made of the exploits of General Harrison's father than of anything that General Harrison had ever done himself. Here are some specimens of American ancestral hero-worship :—

“What has caused this great commotion, motion, motion,  
All the country through?  
It is the people rising up,  
For Tippecanoe and Morton too,  
Tippecanoe and Morton too.  
And with them we'll beat the big I, I, I,  
I and me and my,  
And with them we'll beat the big I.”

There were ten verses of this, and its virtue evidently lay in the “Tippecanoe” of the chorus, and in the tune, which was that of 1840—“Tippecanoe and Tyler too.”

Here is another specimen :—

“With the spirit of his grandsire glows his everlasting fame;  
How it thrills the hearts of freemen still, that ever honoured name;  
With the grand and deathless party, that has never stooped to shame,  
Our Ben is marching on.”

But perhaps the most ambitious effort of this kind was the following :—

“Why it makes me think of 'Forty, and it's somethin', boys, to tell,  
That I was of age and voted, and recollect it well!  
How we tramped the roads a singin', how the cider barrels ran,  
When we 'lected General Harrison, and used up little Van!  
And this is the General's grandson, a chip of the good old block,  
As true as steel, as pure as gold, and as steadfast as a rock!  
It makes me think of 'Forty, boys; it's awful queer,  
But that there fight, for all the world, was jest like this one here.  
For President Van Buren hed ben foolin' with Free Trade,  
And knucklin' down to foreign powers, as if he wce afraid;  
With Tippecanoe and Tyler too we floored 'em there and then,  
And with Tippecanoe and Morton too we'll dust em off agen!  
I don't go much on families, but when our glorious land  
Was tried and vexed, the Harrisons were sure to be on hand.  
His grandad fought in eighteen-twelve, he whipped the Indian nation,  
And there was one in 'seventy-six that signed the Declaration;  
And Benjamin doesn't lag behind, he's kept the record fair,  
Whether makin' a speech or fightin', when it comes to the point, he's there.”

While thousands of Americans, who pride themselves on their 'cuteness and practicalness, sing such songs as these, and while the majority of the American people elect a man to the Presidency largely on the ground of the merits of his grandfather, it would, perhaps, be as well for American cynics and humorists to moderate the sarcasm in which they are so prone to indulge as to the worship of hereditary worth in the old country.

The average American is, at heart, credulous and superstitious; he is a great believer in omens and in luck; and hence it is easier for an impostor or adventurer to impose upon the American people than upon almost any other people in the world. Every kind of monstrous imposture, from Mormonism to "Christian Science," may be found flourishing in the United States. And traces of credulity and fatalism may be found in abundance by the careful observer in connection with a Presidential election. Dr. Edward Everett Hale, of Boston, a very cultured man, wrote a long letter to the *New York Tribune* of September 8, in which he drew an elaborate historical parallel between Van Buren and Cleveland, and between General Harrison's grandfather and General Harrison himself. The letter began thus: "We are launched in a new political campaign, with the advantage of a successful name as a rallying cry. To us old people recollection of the old name and the old campaign is a good omen." What sentiments to be uttered by an eminent intellectual man! "A successful name," "a rallying cry," "the old name," "the old campaign," "a good omen!" Surely the man who can talk thus is dominated by a blind devotion to the past, and has no eyes to perceive the needs and demands of the living present. Hatred of the South and admiration of the West are the only other characteristics of this letter that are worthy of notice. In concluding, Dr. Hale says: "The West so-called is really the middle of the Nation. It speaks for the average sentiment of the nation. There are excellent good reasons, therefore, why the candidate should be a man who represents the West. These reasons have prevailed, very much as they prevailed forty-eight years ago. As it happens the choice has fallen on the grandson of the Harrison who was elected then. He is nominated for exactly the reasons for which his grandfather was nominated, the same causes have produced the same effects; and that is not a rash prophet who says that the current of those events will run exactly in the same stream." It is obvious that even Americans are unable to emancipate themselves from the influences of tradition, from the sentiment of veneration for that which has been successful or great in the past, and that their action is almost as much determined by a regard for these things as that of other nations, though in their case this regard may manifest itself in ways peculiar to themselves.

It is pleasant to note, however, that Mr. Harrison had one other commanding advantage as a candidate, and that is that his moral character is without stain. He is a professed Christian, and a member of the Presbyterian Church, and his walk has been consistent and upright. With regard to this vital matter he was much superior to Mr. Cleveland, and also to Mr. Blaine, his predecessor as Republican candidate for the Presidency. Undoubtedly, this fact had considerable influence with a small proportion of the electors of the United States. I say a small proportion, because my observation of the character of

politicians in America has not convinced me that American electors generally insist upon moral purity as an indispensable qualification for public office. In fact, I am impelled to believe that they are even less careful on this point than British electors are, and that is saying a great deal. But, unquestionably, there is a class of people in the United States, as here, who rank moral fitness above all other qualifications in a candidate, and this class in America forms probably from ten to twenty per cent. of the electorate. Many, if not most, of these were in the ranks of the Republican party, and when Mr. Blaine was thrust upon them by the caucus, four years ago, they either abstained from voting or voted for Mr. Cleveland; probably the bulk of them stayed away from the polls altogether. In Mr. Harrison, however, they had a candidate for whom they could conscientiously vote, and the Republican party again had the advantage of their support. This was not a very important factor in the case, but it undoubtedly was a factor, and therefore it cannot be entirely ignored.

Mr. Harrison, whatever excellences he may possess, is certainly no statesman. In this respect he is not at all singular among his countrymen, for America has no statesmen. Time was when she produced men who were worthy to be called statesmen in the true and large sense of that term, but that was in the palmy days when she was virtually English; but in these, her degenerate days (as I truly think them), she cannot produce the like of her early founders. Politicians there are in plenty in the States, and a sorry set they are; speaking broadly, they are the most venal and the least intelligent class in the community. The ideas of the American politicians are provincial, narrow, and sordid, to an inconceivable degree. It would almost seem that the greater the country the smaller the politician. Certainly there is a significant and impressive contrast in this respect betwixt England and America. This country, which is so small that it is said, humorously or otherwise, to have been described in an American geography as "a small island adjacent to the coast of France," produces statesmen of generous and massive build, of broad and expansive mind, and gifted with sagacity, and penetration, and foresight in an extraordinary degree; while the United States, with an area of wonderful vastness, has rulers who do not rise above the common average of men, whose ideas are meagre and contracted, and who, too frequently, are feeble, and selfish, and shortsighted. I am not an admirer of Grover Cleveland, who is in no large sense a statesman; but I think he has proved that he stands at the head of the politicians of his own country. Let any unprejudiced man take an American politician, Republican or Democrat, and measure him with Mr. Gladstone or with Lord Salisbury, and he will soon become painfully conscious of the disparity between the two men. I am a believer in the principle of paying members of Parliament, and I have

no sympathy with the outcry against professional politicians which we so often hear; but if I thought the condition of things which prevails in America was the natural result of the system of paying members, I would oppose that system from this time forth. But I am not persuaded that the inefficiency and corruption which so conspicuously characterize American politics do flow from this system; in my judgment the causes of these evils lie deeper, and are to be found in the national character. It is possible, perhaps probable, that under the system of paid members, England would never have had her William Ewart Gladstone or her Lord Salisbury (though I really fail to see why she should not); but she would assuredly have had in their places statesmen equally eminent and useful. The more thoughtful Americans are beginning to note the pitiful contrast between their own politicians and European statesmen. As an indication of this the following passage may be cited from a leader in the *Boston Herald*:<sup>1</sup> "In one respect European political leaders set an example which men connected with public affairs in this country would do well to follow: that is, in proving that they have sufficient mental breadth to take up and consider matters wholly outside the range of practical politics." The versatility of Mr. Gladstone, Mr. John Morley, Mr. A. J. Balfour, and other English statesmen is then referred to, and the article proceeds: "On the continent of Europe this same tendency towards many-sided development is equally a characteristic of the most prominent public men; but in this country it would be hard to name a distinguished politician, using this term in its best sense" [why does not the cautious journalist say, "distinguished statesman"?], "who has shown striking ability in any other line." The greatest statesmen whose names appear on the pages of American history were virtually Englishmen. This despised little island has produced the most capable rulers and men of affairs, both of the Old and the New Worlds.

With a view of taking Mr. Harrison's measure as a statesman, let us look at some of his utterances during the campaign that has lately closed. Of these the most important is the letter in which he formally accepted the nomination for the Presidency, which was by far his most ambitious effort, and which is said to have been the work of a whole summer. On the Tariff question he says:— "Those who teach that the import duty upon foreign goods sold in our market is paid by the consumer, and that the price of the domestic competing article is enhanced to the amount of the duty on the imported article—that every million of dollars collected for customs duties represents many millions more which do not reach the Treasury, but are paid by our citizens as the increased cost of domestic productions resulting from the Tariff laws—may not intend to discredit in the minds of others our system of levying duties on

<sup>1</sup> October 20th, 1888.

competing foreign products, but it is clearly already discredited in their own." Here Mr. Harrison ridicules the doctrines that the American consumer pays the import duty on foreign goods sold in the American markets; that the American producer is enabled by the tariff to raise the price of his goods to the artificial point of the imported article, and thus to enrich himself at the expense of the American consumer; and that the aggregate amount thus indirectly taken out of the pockets of the people is far greater than the duties directly collected through the Custom Houses. In other words, Mr. Harrison does not believe that the American consumer pays the duty on foreign goods; or that the American manufacturer, under the tariff, gets more than a fair and natural price for his wares; or that anything beyond the Customs duties is taken from the people by the tariff system. A man who, at this time of day, commits himself to such positions as these must for ever abandon all pretensions to be a statesman. So ridiculous are his theories that they are alike incapable and unworthy of serious argument; the only proper way to meet them is by a *reductio ad absurdum*. The best comment I have seen upon General Harrison's position is the following:—

"A farmer, bringing home from market the clothing, lumber, and other things for which he had exchanged his grain, encountered a railroad agent disguised as a philanthropist.

"'I am a protector of your industry,' said the railroad agent, 'and I want forty-seven per cent. of all you have in your waggon.'

"'You are a queer protector,' said the farmer, 'pray explain.'

(c) "'Why,' replied the agent, 'you want the things I am taking from you, don't you?'

"'I certainly do,' replied the farmer.

"'Very well,' said the railroad agent, 'go home and raise some more grain and I will sell them to you. This will give you more work to do, and preserve the home market for us both.'

"'You are very kind,' said the bewildered farmer, 'and I have no doubt you mean well, though I don't clearly understand it. But cannot I induce you to be content with forty per cent. of my load? You should leave the sheep some of his skin, even if you do take his fleece—'

"'You may not intend,' broke in the road agent impatiently, 'to discredit my system in the minds of others, but it is clearly already discredited in your own. You have been studying maxims instead of markets. However, I will not stop to refute your theory; and, besides, I think I hear something coming.'

"With these words the railroad agent took his forty-seven per cent., and hurriedly departed."

Mr. Harrison proceeds: "I do not stop to refute this [common sense] theory as to the effect of our tariff duties. Those who advance it are students of maxims and not of markets." Mr. Harrison may be valiant on the field of battle, but in declining to confute the theory at which he scoffs he certainly shows the discretion which is said to be the better part of valour. The levity

with which he treats this matter, and the haste with which he hops away from it, suggest the suspicion that he has met an issue with which he is incapable of grappling. Let us hear him on the Tariff once more:—"We believe it to be one of the worthy objects of tariff legislation to preserve the American market for American producers, and to maintain the American scale of wages, and by adequate discriminating duties upon foreign competing products. The effect of lower rates and larger importations upon the public revenue is contingent and doubtful, but not so the effect upon American production and American wages. Less work and lower wages must be accepted as the inevitable result of the increased offering of foreign goods in our market." Mr. Harrison believes, that is to say, that the more trade America does the less work there will be for the people there, and the less wages they will get for doing what work they do! Was there ever a more extraordinary proposition propounded by a man who claims to be a statesman?

We need not further concern ourselves, however, with Mr. Harrison's letter of acceptance, for the Tariff question is the only one of general interest which it discusses; it is chiefly occupied with matters which are local, American, and, in a comparative sense, provincial. These matters are, moreover, discussed, for the most part, in a tone of narrow and exclusive Americanism. This is more particularly true of the paragraphs relating to immigration, foreign contract labourers, and foreign relations. The impression left on the mind by the document as a whole is that it is the work of a feeble and timid man, who has no firm, vigorous, comprehensive grasp of great principles; a man afraid to trust himself, lacking in courage and confidence, and who therefore is almost sure to become the tool of stronger men; a man possessing but small force of character, who has not studied profoundly the vital problems of the time, and consequently has no matured convictions in regard to them.

One of the curiosities, one might almost say one of the mysteries, of the Presidential campaign was that General Harrison, the candidate of the Republican party, who ought in the nature of things to have been most prominent in the canvass, was rigidly confined, not only to his own State, but practically to the immediate vicinity of his own house. While this was the case, Mr. Blaine was on the stump in Maine, New York, Michigan, and even in Indiana, Harrison's own State. This treatment of Mr. Harrison could not be due to the fact that he was unable to speak in public, for he is a practised public speaker and displays fair ability on the platform; indeed he is a much more intelligent and capable speaker than scores of the men who were placed on the stump by the Republican party. There is pretty good evidence, moreover, that this somewhat dictatorial closing of Mr. Harrison's mouth was not in accordance with his own wishes. In illustration of this a little incident may be

mentioned which took place in New York city. Towards the end of the campaign the Democratic business men of that city held a parade, and they were reviewed by President Cleveland from a stand in Madison Square. The Republicans were to hold a similar parade on the following Saturday, and they naturally desired to have their procession reviewed by the Republican candidate, General Harrison. So they asked the General's son, Russell B. Harrison, who happened to be in the city, to invite his father to be present. He telegraphed to his father, who consented to come on one condition, and that was that Senator Quay, Chairman of the Republican National Committee, should give his consent. When the matter was mentioned to Mr. Quay he flew into a towering rage and thundered forth: "No, General Harrison shall not come here. He shall not leave Indianapolis. I am not going to imperil the success of the campaign by bringing him here. He shall stay at home." This incident not only shows how tyrannically the Republicans were ruled by Mr. Quay (of whom more anon), but also throws some light upon the amicable relations which existed between the Republican leaders. It may be mentioned, by the by, that according to common report, General Harrison and Mr. Blaine were not upon speaking terms.

"Where is Mr. Harrison?" was the question asked on all hands. "Why does he not appear in the various States as the standard bearer of his party?" And such comments as these were called forth by an apparently anomalous condition of affairs: "Mr. Blaine, when he was the candidate, was as pervading and as active as he is now. There is no apparent reason why the precedent set in his case should not be followed by Mr. Harrison. As a matter of taste Mr. Harrison's presence before the voters would be as permissible as Mr. Blaine's was four years ago; it would, it may be added, be rather more proper than Mr. Blaine's tremendous activity this year. There are as many reasons why Mr. Blaine should be less conspicuous as there are why Mr. Harrison should be more so; as Mr. Blaine, though powerless to get the nomination he coveted, was quite capable of preventing it going to any of his prominent rivals, so now, though he be not the candidate, he is reaping all the glory of the campaign, such as it is. It is, perhaps, none of our concern, but we confess that we do not think that Mr. Harrison is being treated decently. He is not an eminent man, but he holds a very eminent position, for the time being, in his party, and the party leaders are acting towards him as if he were not worthy of it. This is not fair to him, and, moreover, it is not fair to the party. Mr. Harrison is much more worthy, perhaps we should say much less unworthy, of his position than Mr. Blaine was in 1884, and much more worthy than Mr. Blaine is of the prominence now granted to the latter."<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *New York Times*, October 31, 1888.

Poor General Harrison, confined to Indianapolis, was forced to content himself by making short addresses to such delegations as chose to visit him at his own home, and of these there were a great many. For two or three months the General spoke for ten or twenty minutes every day, and he succeeded in performing the astounding feat of doing this vast amount of talking without saying anything; at all events he came as near to saying nothing as any man possibly could under such circumstances. These brief speeches are marked by commonplace and platitude to a degree that is quite extraordinary; every one of them bears the stamp of mediocrity. Let us take a few samples. Speaking on September 20 General Harrison made the following reference to England:

"I do not think that there is any doubt what tariff policy England would wish us to adopt, and yet some say that England is trembling lest we should adopt Free Trade here, and so rob her of other markets that she now enjoys. The story of our colonial days, when England, with selfish and insatiate avarice, laid her repressing hand upon our infant manufactures and attempted to suppress them all, furnishes the first object lesson she gave us. Another was given when the life of this nation—the child of England, as she had been wont to call us, speaking the mother tongue, having many institutions inherited from her—was imperilled. The offer of Free Trade by the Confederacy so touched the commercial greed of England that she forgot the ties of blood and went to the verge of war with us to advance the cause of the rebel Government. But what England wants or what any other country wants is not very important—certainly not conclusive. What is best for us and for our people should be the decisive question."

In striking contrast to the spirit of this reference to England is the tone which Mr. Harrison adopted towards the Germans in a subsequent speech on October 12. He almost exhausted the language of eulogy in addressing his "German-American friends," praising them for their love of home, their defence of the Union in the war, and their virtue and industry. Of course the difference is accounted for, not by the fact that the Germans are superior to the British (even in Mr. Harrison's estimation), but by the much more practical consideration that there is a very large "German vote" in the United States. With regard to the Irish, Mr. Harrison was charged with having maligned their character by exclaiming, when interrupted by some Irish auditors in a meeting in 1876: "It is easy to know a man's nationality. We had more of them to contend against in the late rebellion than we had in the Union service. They are only good to shovel dirt and grade railroads. If it were not for them we would not need half our penitentiaries." Mr. Harrison repudiates this language; but Messrs. William Condon, Robert Sanders, Michael F. Purcell, John A. Wilson, and A. G. Creed, all of Bloomington, Illinois, have sworn affidavits that they were present and heard the General use the words quoted. Another charge brought against Mr. Harrison was that he said a dollar a day was enough for any working man, and that he himself could live on



that amount. This also he indignantly denied, both in a letter, written on September 8 to W. C. Sheppard, of March Chunk, Pennsylvania, and in a speech at Indianapolis on October 24. The *Indianapolis Journal* offered a reward of a thousand dollars for proof that Mr. Harrison ever used the words attributed to him. On September 25, 1888, John G. Schwartz, of Brightwood, Indiana, swore an affidavit before Joseph F. Fanning, Notary Public, in which he stated that he was present at a conference with Mr. Harrison and others in July 1877, and that "the said Benjamin Harrison said that the men ought to return to their work; that the railroads could not afford to pay higher wages; that the wages was enough, and that one dollar a day was enough for any working man; that he himself could live on that amount." General Harrison's disclaimers will, of course, be accepted; but still these affidavits are ugly documents, if only from the fact that they throw a lurid light upon electioneering tactics in the United States.

The stock subject of Mr. Harrison in his little speeches was what he called "the American system of Protection." This was what made America a paradise for the workman. Abolish this, and you would transfer a certain amount of America's labour to foreign shops, and bring the proud American artisan "into competition with the under-paid labour of the old country." He asserted that the object of the struggle in which they were engaged was "to preserve our own American market for our own working men, and to maintain here a living standard of wages." To a couple of hundred students who waited on him on September 28, he said: "I suggest to them that they be not only students of books and maxims, but also of men and of the markets; that in the study of the tariff question they do not forget, as so many do, that they are Americans." The virtue of the American Protective system, according to General Harrison, is that it keeps imports out of the country; the vice of the proposed Democratic modification of that system was that it would let imports flow in: "The Protective system is a barrier against the flood of foreign importations and the competition of under-paid labour in Europe. Those who want to lower the dyke owe it to those who live behind it to make a plain statement of their purposes. Do they want to invite the flood, or do they believe in the dyke, but think it will afford adequate protection at a lower level." Again: "The policy of the Democratic party—the revision of our tariff laws as indicated by the Democratic party, a revenue-only tariff, or progressive Free Trade, means a vast and sudden increase of importations. Is there a man here so dull as not to know that this means diminished work in our American shops?"

Ignorance is a great help to a man when he wishes to dogmatise,

<sup>1</sup> Speech at Indianapolis. August 13, 1888.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* October 24

and Mr. Harrison could never have committed himself to such hazardous assertions as these had he not been in happy ignorance upon what he was talking about. Mr. Secretary Frelinghuysen, another eminent Republican, in his *Labour in Foreign Countries*, says that larger importations "may be principally ascribed to two causes—an increase in the general prosperity of the United States, with consequent augmentation of their ability to purchase, and a reduction in the price of imported articles." So Mr. Harrison believes that a nation's augmented power to purchase, shown in increased importations, instead of being an evidence of prosperity, is a sign of the poverty of the people who can thus afford to buy more commodities. Mr. Harrison is equally astray in asserting that increased importation means diminished domestic production; for the history of his own country demonstrates that reduction of the tariff has never been followed either by decrease of home production or by a lowering of wages. From 1850 to 1860 was the low tariff, or as Mr. Blaine and his disciples delight to call it, "Free Trade era" in the United States. And a very good era too it was, as the following facts will show:—Between 1850 and 1860 the products of manufacturing industries increased 85·5 per cent., as against 79·54 per cent. between 1860 and 1870, and 58·59 per cent. between 1870 and 1880. The cash value of farms rose 103 per cent. between 1850 and 1860; 39 per cent. from 1860 to 1870; and only 10 per cent. from 1870 to 1880. Real and personal property in the United States increased 40 per cent. between 1830 and 1840; 37 per cent. from 1840 to 1850; 184 per cent. from 1850 to 1860. It has been computed that if the wealth of the United States had increased from 1860 to 1880 at the rate which prevailed during the "Free Trade era," it would have amounted to 83,000,000,000 of dollars in 1880 instead of the 43,300,000,000 which it actually did amount to in that year. The same tale is told by the figures as to work and wages during the "Free Trade era." During this period the number of people employed in the manufacturing industries increased 36·86 per cent., and their wages increased 60·63 per cent.; in the woollen mills the hands employed increased 18½ per cent. and wages 36·80 per cent.; in carpet mills the employes increased 8 per cent., and wages 24 per cent.; in the production of iron ore the increase of the workers was 45 per cent., while the increase of wages was 57 per cent. All the evidence that can be collected on the point goes to show that the United States have never known ten such prosperous years as those in which their economic policy approached most nearly to Free Trade. To that nation these years were what Joseph's seven years of plenty were to Egypt.

We may now turn from General Harrison himself to consider the means by which he was elected. When the General was a candidate for the honour of representing Indiana in the United States Senate

he said : " I covet for myself the free and unpurchased support of my fellow-citizens." He may have cherished a similar ambition with regard to the Presidential election, though I am not aware that he ever expressed it. Had he given expression to the desire that he might be elected only by " free and unpurchased support " it would have been vain ; for there is ample evidence to prove that the Republicans were prepared to resort to wholesale bribery to carry their candidate, and also conclusive proof that they did resort to it.

Senator Quay has been referred to. The selection of this notorious " boss " as chairman of the Republican National Committee was a fact of sinister significance. It clearly indicated that " Sunday School politics "—to use his own contemptuous phrase—were to have no place in this election, and that he was not to be restrained from winning a victory by any nonsensical talk about conscience, honour, purity of election, or other like namby-pamby stuff. Mr. Quay's appointment meant business in a very grim sense. This will appear more clearly if we consider Mr. Quay's history. Mr. Quay hails from Philadelphia, which city, though it is reputed to be pious and Quakerish, is politically ruled by him. A correspondent of the *New York Times*, writing from Philadelphia on October 24, said it was there believed that Quay's ambition was to " snatch victory from the jaws of defeat by any means at any cost," for his own personal elevation and enrichment, and that he would " stop short of nothing criminal to carry the States of New York and Indiana for Harrison." The political career of Mr. Quay began in Pennsylvania in 1878, when he was made chairman of the State Republican Committee for the election of Governor, and by an unscrupulous use of money he succeeded in carrying his man. Shortly after that a Bill was introduced into the State legislature which proposed to mulct the people of the State in the sum of four million dollars for damage which had been incurred to railway property in Allegheny county during some strike riots in 1877. The people were up in arms against the Bill, but in order to force it through some members of the legislature were bribed by William H. Kemble, who was Quay's tool. If the Bill passed it would require the Governor's signature ; the Governor was indebted to Quay for his election ; it would be well therefore to have a friend in the Governor's council in the person of Quay, so the latter was elected Secretary of State. But the bribers were found out and indicted. William H. Kemble, Charles B. Salter, George F. Smith, Emil J. Petroff, E. C. Clarke, A. W. Leisenring, D. C. Shoemaker, Jesse R. Crawford, and F. W. Rumberger were the guilty men. They were sentenced to pay a fine of a thousand dollars each, to two years' imprisonment, and to disqualification for holding any office of " honour, profit, or trust in the commonwealth." But Quay did not desert his friends. As Secretary of State he was a member of the Board of

Pardons, and four days after the bribers had been sentenced, a meeting of this Board was held. It lasted twenty minutes, and when it was over Kemble and his associates were free men, set at liberty by a decision of the Board of Pardons, of which Mr. Quay was the ruling spirit. This is simply one of the feats of the redoubtable "boss." When he was candidate for the office of State Treasurer in 1885, the *Philadelphia Press*, on July 4 of that year, said: "When the memories of the Pardon Board are revived in every Democratic newspaper and on every Democratic stump, how shall the attack be met? When the management of the Treasury is overhauled, and the Democratic batteries open the broadsides, with which well-informed people know they are already shot up to the muzzle, how can we silence them or escape being silenced ourselves?" On July 7 the same journal, in the discharge of "a high public duty," said: "The nomination of Colonel Quay would put the party upon the defensive from the start. . . . Every Democratic newspaper and stump would ring with the echoes of the riot, bribery, and the Pardon Board. And, *what is still more important, such a campaign would inevitably lift the lid from the administration of the Treasury itself, and uncover secrets before which Republicans would stand dumb.*" But Quay, undeterred by these ominous threats, held on his way, and not only triumphed, but succeeded in so terrorizing the Press, and everybody else in Pennsylvania, that the threatened exposures were never made. After all this had taken place he worked his way into the United States Senate. It was asserted over and over again in the American newspapers that he was appointed chairman of the Republican National Committee chiefly on the ground of his successful electioneering exploits in Pennsylvania.

The first step Mr. Quay took after his appointment was to surround himself with a "kitchen cabinet," composed of his Philadelphia associates. It included Senator Bill Chandler, ex-Senator Steve Dorsey, Mr. Chris Magee, Senator Rutan, Mr. Jay Hubbell, ex-Sheriff Leeds, Captain J. C. Delancy, and Charles E. Voorhees. Steve Dorsey has the reputation of having secured Indiana for the Republicans in 1880, under General Arthur's instructions, by his skilful, profuse, and corrupt use of funds which were raised for the purpose of debauching the electorate of that State. General Arthur was so proud of the disreputable work of his lieutenant that he complimented him on it at a public dinner. It was men of this stamp that Quay appointed members of his "kitchen cabinet."

With characteristic audacity Mr. Quay issued a circular announcing that the National Republican Committee offered rewards amounting in all to 25,000 dollars for the arrest and conviction of persons guilty of illegal registration or illegal voting in New York or Brooklyn. This was done on the principle of assuming a virtue

though you have it not, and was of course designed to divert public attention from his own proceedings. Matt Quay exerting himself to secure an honest election was a sight for the gods. The ludicrous feature of the business was that the first man caught at illegal registration avowed himself to be a Republican, who had registered in four different districts. He was sentenced to two and a half years' imprisonment. Notwithstanding this awkward incident, however, Mr. Quay continued to mature his "colonization" schemes. The average English reader is probably at a loss to understand what "colonization" means. To "colonize," then, in American parlance, is to draft a number of voters from a State where there is a safe and reliable majority to a doubtful State. The usual phrase—there was a safe Republican majority; New York he was not to be doubtful, Mr. Quay's plan was to draft from that State talk about Indiana and New York a sufficient number of namby-pamby stuff. election. There is good reason for believing they grim sense. This both these States on a very extensive scale. Quay's history. Mr. of for this purpose were chiefly coloured men, though it is reputed to be the districts where they were to vote just plain. A correspondent day, in order that they might register as electors on October 24, It was remarked that in New York, a wet ambition was to "snatch for registration expired, the coloured population at any cost," for his a large accession to its numbers. They said that he would "stop Philadelphia to vote in New York, and thus he states of New York and an honest election. The Democrats sent a letter of Mr. Quay began in men from Philadelphia, who searched for the chairman of the State New York, and discovered therein his brother Governor, and by an untownsmen, many of whom were better known for carrying his man. Shortly than anywhere else. News of this move quickly reached the legislature which produced one immediate result was that a train of the sum of four million strong, who had started from Philadelphia to buy railway property in short at Trenton, and then went home again, in 1877. The people pursued, not only in New York city, but in order to force it through State, in West Virginia, and most extensively by William H. Kemble, Indiana.

Of course this "colonization" work was indebted to Quay for his Quay did not run short of funds. From to have a friend in the said to have received no less than 500,000, so the latter was elected which John Wanamaker and A. J. Drexler found out and indicted. the carpet and woollen manufacturers gave 290,000, like F. Smith, Emil J. It may startle many people who know Mr. Wanamaker, Jesse R. supporter of Moody and Sankey and as a Southern man. They were intentent, to learn that he is an intimate of Quay; and that he was in constant and close association with him during the election. Politics make strange bed-fellows—especially in America. Mr. Wanamaker was understood to be circling at the Secretaryship of

the Treasury, which office he expected to obtain if General Harrison was elected.<sup>1</sup> Another of Mr. Wanamaker's eccentricities is that, while he contributes large sums of money to prop up the tariff system in America, he seeks to escape the effects of that system by establishing a factory in Germany, where he employs the "pauper labour" which his party so fervently denounces, and, of course, deprives his own countrymen of the amount of labour which he gives to foreigners. A New York paper suggested, somewhat cruelly, that he ought to pay 100,000 dollars to a foreign artist to illustrate the text—"Woe unto you, Pharisees." is overhauled. Efforts were worthily seconded by other Republican which well-informed Jas. P. Foster, president of the Republican muzzles, how can a Republican senator, I believe, sent out what came On July 7 the said "Fat Circular." This circular was sent chiefly duty," said: "The manufacturers. It says that the League "is no upon the defensive for dress parade, but is an every day paper and stump work practical political workers, who have in four the Pardon Board. army of over 400,000 men to fight against *paign would inevitably* British gold, and the Democratic Hessians *Treasury itself, and under her banners.*" The circular also says with *stand dumb.*" But Quay It is a fact that the manufacturers of the on his way, and not only *most benefited by our tariff laws,* have been the Press, and everybody *due to the success of the party which gave* exposures were never *much is about to engage in a life and death* worked his way into the. Again: "The manufacturers of Penn- over and over again *highly protected than anybody else, and who* appointed chairman of *every year when times are prosperous, prac-* on the ground of his *tards the maintenance of the ascendancy of* sylvania. If I had my way about it I would put the

The first step Mr. Quay, Pennsylvania under the fire, and *try all the fat out* round himself with a "this savage document had upon the Pennsyl- associates. It included was not able to learn." Dorsey, Mr. Chris Ma has been made to Indiana. From all I can Sheriff Leeds, Captain & this appears to be, electorally, one of the Steve Dorsey has the re the Union. This may be owing to the Republicans in 1880, un was made upon its virtue in 1880 under skilful, profuse, and corrupt, Arthur and also to the fact that it was purpose of debauching the etc. "Dorsey's Soap" is still talked of was so proud of the disre Morton, the new vice-President, is also complimented him o taken a prominent part in the demoralization stamp that Quay *equally unscrupulous have been made in*

With characteristic with the recent election. The Democratic Committee of the State asked the Republican Committee to co-

<sup>1</sup> He has actually received the Postmaster-Generalship.

<sup>2</sup> That it was not without effect, however, is indicated by the £100,000 from Philadelphia.

operate with it to prevent illegal voting, but the proposition was declined. It was reported somewhat early in the campaign that the Republican National Committee had sent 100,000 dollars to Indiana, and the reports which came from the State were to the effect that Indiana farmers "hail election day as a child hails Christmas. They see nothing debasing or vicious in selling their votes, and they look sharp for the highest bidder." The "floating vote" of the State was estimated this year at about 25,000, nearly all of it being purchasable, and the competition for it on the part of the political managers was said to be very lively. As the Republicans had the most money they would naturally get the most votes.

Perhaps the most infamous letter of the whole campaign is that written by Colonel Dudley, treasurer of the National Republican Committee, to the chairman of the Republican Committees of Indiana. In this letter Dudley says:—

"With proper financial assistance Indiana is surely Republican for Governor and President. . . . Your Committee will certainly receive from Chairman Huston (of the Republican State Committee of Indiana) *the financial assistance necessary to hold our floaters and doubtful voters, and gain enough of the other kind to give Harrison and Morton 10,000 plurality.* . . . See that our workers know every Republican voter entitled to vote, and see that they do vote. *Divide the floaters into blocks of five, and put a trusted man with necessary funds in charge of those five, and make him responsible that none gets away, and that all vote our ticket.* . . . *There will be no doubt of your receiving the necessary financial assistance through the National, State, and County Committees, only see that it is husbanded and made to produce results."*

Colonel Dudley is the personal friend of Mr. Harrison, and he was the only member of the Republican National Committee in whom the General had absolute confidence; in fact, he was regarded as General Harrison's special representative in the Committee. The *New York Times* described the letter as "such as only a conscienceless political corruptionist could conceive, and only a scoundrel write. It is, in truth, a scoundrel's letter, the most scoundrelly and shameless we ever remember to have seen put forth by a man of prominence in the council of a great party. It is a direct incitement to criminal acts. It is an election-day hand-book for the official vote-buyers and bribery corps of the Republicans in Indiana. . . . It is a briber's letter, a corruptionist's appeal, a penitentiary offence." Dudley at once commenced an action for libel against the *Times*, but he took care to bring it in the Supreme Court, well-knowing that it could not be reached for probably a year. It was simply a game of "bluff." The action will now be dropped. On November 4 a warrant was issued at Indianapolis for Dudley's arrest, but as it can only be executed in Indiana he will probably not venture into the State. It is a significant fact, however, that General Harrison

has maintained a deliberate silence on this letter, and has steadily declined to condemn (though repeatedly requested to do so) what is probably the most iniquitous attempt that has ever been made, even in America, to corrupt the franchise.

The facts which I have adduced are of such a painful and startling nature that I fear I shall be accused of exaggerating them for the purpose of making a case against the Americans. I can only say that I have greatly understated the case, and that I have a great many facts in my possession which would more than corroborate what I have advanced, but which I cannot here use for lack of space. I expected to find political corruption in America; but I certainly did not anticipate that I should find such a sad and deplorable state of affairs as I have been compelled to faintly set forth in this article. It is well, however, that the truth on these matters should be known in this country, especially as abuse and misrepresentation of England was a leading feature of the recent Presidential campaign.

The victory of the Republicans, even had it been gained by fair means instead of foul, could only be regarded as a distinctly retrograde step. It is a backward movement in at least three important respects. As Mr. Carl Schurz, formerly a Republican Secretary of State, points out, the Republican party, for the first time in its history, has become the advocate of extravagant expenditure, and also for the first time has set itself against any reduction or revision of the tariff. "Indeed, it advocates higher tariff duties, and the repeal of all internal taxes rather than surrender any part of our protective system." This attitude towards economic questions is not only obstinate and foolish, but dangerous, and if it is persisted in its inevitable result will be to produce extreme and violent changes which will convulse the United States to the very centre. But this, after all, is a matter which chiefly concerns the American people themselves. The Republican policy in relation to the Canadian question, which is still unsettled, is, on the other hand, a subject which vitally concerns the British people. Here also the change from a Democratic to a Republican administration will be for the worse. The Republican tone is warlike, irritating, offensive; Mr. Harrison has climbed to power largely by base appeals to the anti-English feeling of his countrymen, which is both more intense and more widespread than is commonly supposed; he represents that peculiarly narrow and disagreeable Americanism which is now rapidly attaining such large proportions. War between two such peoples as England and the United States ought to be impossible; before I visited the States I firmly believed it was impossible; but I cannot believe so any longer. There is a spirit in certain of the American people which, if it grows much more, will simply make us fight. That spirit has frequently expressed itself in my hearing thus: "We've licked the British twice, and we shall have to lick them again." This is the



spirit which goaded the chief organ of the Dominion Government into speaking, on October 10, in the following heated terms:—"Has it ever happened in the history of the world that a country took such liberties with the possessions of another as the United States is taking with Canada without having first resolved upon going to war with the insulted nation? There has been a studied interference in our internal affairs. We have congressmen and senators threatening the integrity of Canada. The most wanton slanders have been uttered in their halls of legislation. We venture to assert that if such proceedings as these were employed by one European country toward another, if such language, such threats, such studiously hostile demonstrations, were directed by the statesmen and press of England to France, or of Germany to Austria, or by the most powerful of nations to the feeblest of the Old World kingdoms, war would be inevitable. The time has at length arrived when on both sides of the international boundary all fair-minded men must agree that the dignity and the honour of both countries call for the abandonment of an attitude which conveys a standing insult and menace to the Canadian Dominion." With such a spirit as this simmering on both sides of the border there is grave danger ahead. When James G. Blaine gets into power, as he will do under General Harrison, even though he be not in office,<sup>1</sup> we may wake up some fine morning to find that he has plunged mother and daughter nations into a dreadful war—the most dreadful of modern times.

GEORGE BROOKS.

<sup>1</sup> These words were written before Mr. Harrison had appointed his Cabinet. That Cabinet is emphatically a Blaine Cabinet, as Mr. Blaine holds the important office of Secretary of State, and is, besides, the most powerful personality among the Ministers.

## HOME AFFAIRS.

THE name of Richard Pigott will live in history with that of Titus Oates. The last is, indeed, in some danger of falling into obscurity by reason of the greater brilliancy of the achievements which attach to the former. Oates was sufficiently audacious in a bolder age, but he did not befooled the *Times*. Pigott has earned an undying notoriety by destroying at a blow the moral influence of the greatest newspaper the world has ever had. And this is the chief result of the Special Commission Court, so far as it has gone. The *Times* has withdrawn the letters *en bloc*, and made to the public, rather than to the persons whom it has so deeply wronged, such an apology as its excessive natural pride would allow. Never was there such a collapse. When all the friends of the *Times* had been swearing by its extreme acuteness and penetration in this particular matter, and when many other persons, who had no special friendship for the journal, had given its conductors credit for some ordinary business prudence, and were thus inclined to be dubious concerning the letters, we were told by the one man upon whom the *Times* had relied—a worthless person whose antecedents were common knowledge in Dublin—that he had forged the precious documents under the stress of extreme necessity. Now, if one thing is clear in this matter, it is this—that the *Times* must have had suspicion concerning the honesty of these letters. It has been admitted that as early as last November, Pigott was imploring the *Times* to save him from the witness-box, and he went so far as to write that if he were brought before the Court, he should have to make serious admissions in cross-examination! Again—and this is most significant—it was perfectly well known in the *Times*' office that Pigott had been in secret conclave with the other side; that he had been closeted with Mr. Parnell, Mr. Labouchere, and Mr. G. Lewis (the solicitor), and that he had not only received Mr. Lewis separately at his hotel, but that he had himself called upon Mr. Lewis at his office. Yet the *Times* persisted to the end. They put their "right-hand man"—to use the expressive phrase of Mr. John Walter—into the box, and when Pigott broke down, under the damning interrogatories of Sir C. Russell, and fled to Madrid to commit suicide—then, and then only, did the prosecution withdraw their forgeries. The expert who had been ready to go into the box to support the views of the *Times*,

did not emerge from his obscurity, and the house of cards, the strength of which had been trumpeted throughout the world for many months, came to the ground. In withdrawing the forgeries the Attorney-General insisted that the only fault of the *Times* was that they had been imposed upon. Public opinion will, however, not allow this plea. The *Times* have a terrible responsibility in this matter which they cannot so easily dispose of. There is a chance that this responsibility will, in part, have to be discharged in sterling, since several actions for libel have been entered against them in respect of the forgeries. Apart from this, there is the moral responsibility which an outraged public opinion rightly fixes upon those who attempt to stab a political adversary in the back, simply because he is a political adversary. This cannot be got rid of. It is idle for the *Times* to say: "We blundered in ignorance." In the first place it was not their business to publish these forgeries. Latterly journalism has ventured into strange paths, but nobody has been more indignant than the *Times* at the attempt to put certain public men in the pillory for social offences which could not be reached by the law. In the case of Mr. Parnell and his colleagues, there was much less justification for attack. But admitting that it was proper to publish the letters, one would have thought that the *Times* would make every possible inquiry to avoid mistake. They must have known, being, it is to be presumed, men of ordinary intelligence, that unless the letters were absolutely genuine, they were not only perpetrating a moral assassination, but at the same time risking in their own persons moral ruin. It was an amazing thing to learn that they took absolutely no precautions. We decline to admit that the opinion of an expert in caligraphy saves the *Times*. It does nothing of the sort. They stand convicted not only of playing chuck-farthing with the reputation of a great newspaper, but of a negligence which is absolutely criminal, since it has led them to seek the destruction of the leaders of a whole people for the sake of political gain.

The friends of the popular party in Ireland are naturally vastly elated at the downfall of the *Times*. And they are determined that the Government, which has helped the *Times* in every possible way to make good the case against the Irish leaders, shall bear their share of responsibility for what has happened. It is both natural and just. Before the *Times* would face the great matter of the letters, upon which they have come to such bitter grief, they made a desperate effort to obscure the real issue by a cloud of evidence relating to other matters. And here the Government assisted them in every possible way. The fact of the Attorney-General holding the leading brief for the *Times* was of itself sufficiently suspicious. Sir R. Webster tells us, indeed, that all his knowledge of the *Times*' case came through Mr. Soames. We are content to believe him, though it is difficult to understand the mental processes by which the Attorney-General, if he

had any "official knowledge" upon the subject with which he dealt, was able to debar himself from making use of it. But be this as it may, it is certain that Mr. Soames had help which he ought not to have had. Mr. Balfour placed at his disposal the whole of the archives of the Irish office and the Executive officers of the Irish Government; magistrates and police were employed for weeks in the preparation of evidence which they afterwards tendered in court. Mr. Balfour justifies this on the ground that it was the duty of the Government to help the Commission in every way to arrive at the truth. He would no doubt say as much concerning the production of convicts as informers in the interests of the *Times*. An Irish head-constable was admitted to see one Tracoy at Millbank as the agent of Mr. Soames, and Pigott made a mysterious journey to Chatham to see the dynamitard Daly, it is said by Daly's invitation. Mr. Anderson of the Home Office thought it right to place certain of the numerous documents, sent to him by Le Caron, "the military spy," in the hands of their author and of Mr. Houston. From some of these documents, which were never seen by the defendants' counsel, Le Caron's evidence was prepared. It was stated in the House of Commons that Mr. Anderson was to be called as a witness before the Commission, but neither Mr. Anderson nor certain of the "convicts," who were interviewed in the interests of the *Times*, have appeared. We would put it to any impartial person to say what is the significance of this aggregation of facts. Let it be remembered that the Government, equally with the *Times*, are politically opposed to the defendants in the inquiry; that the Government drafted the Bill constituting the Commission when the Attorney-General was in possession of the facts of the *Times*' case and Mr. Smith had seen Mr. Walter; that they pushed it through Parliament practically unamended, and in face of the strongest protest; and finally that their interests were deeply engaged in obtaining a verdict against the defendants. We venture to think there is here something more than mere suspicion against the Government.<sup>1</sup> And we are glad to think that Ministers are to be put upon their defence in Parliament at the first opportunity. The more reasonable men among their supporters are certainly not at all satisfied with what has been done. They see clearly enough that the fall of the *Times* involves the backers of the *Times*. And they are anxious concerning the effect upon the country. They know that the mass of the electors do not trouble about refinements—that they have a rough and ready way of executing justice. So it comes about that there is immense chagrin that the Government should have blundered into such a position. If a scapegoat is wanted, the Attorney-General may suffer. It is alleged—we know not on what grounds—that unless he had misled the Government at the outset as to the quality of the *Times*' case, the Commission Bill would never have seen the light of the day

❶ <sup>1</sup> Written before the recent debate.

—that the Parnellites would have had to fight it out with the country, or remain under the unjust stigma of the *Times'* forgeries. And it is said further that Sir R. Webster ought not to have appeared in the case. Poor Sir Richard! There probably never was a more popular Attorney-General at the Bar, or (before this unfortunate business began) a more popular official in the House of Commons. Yet, as we write, he is marked for a special and an immediate attack in Parliament for numerous *laches*. First, he will be held to have been neglecting his duty to the Government to attend to the *Times*; that as an officer of the Government he ought not to have appeared in a political prosecution; that he ought to have known, and must have known, that the *Times'* case was in its main issue dishonest, and that he was guilty of unprofessional conduct in not advising the withdrawal of the allegations underlying this issue at the very earliest moment they became suspected.

It is useful in view of the controversy which is thus opening up, and which goes far beyond the person of the Attorney-General, to recall, however briefly, the kind of "proof" which the *Times* tendered to the Commission Court in support of the famous letters. Pigott, being forced into the box against his will, made the best of it as long as he could. He told his story—and an amazing story it was—with sufficient assurance. We learnt in much detail how he first heard of the letters through Eugene Davis, at Lausanne; how in Paris, one Murphy, an old compositor on the *Irishman*, when the *Irishman* was Pigott's property, showed him the letters but refused to sell them without an order from the Clan-na-Gael; how Pigott personally got an authority from Breslin in New York; how by means of this authority he received the Parnell letters from Murphy, £500 being paid for this first batch; how Murphy afterwards was wroth because he could not get the letters back; how the second batch came to Pigott through one Tom Brown, a Fenian, whom he met "by chance" in a Paris *café*; and how the third batch came from a man unknown who "mentioned the name of Brown." Certain mysterious ceremonies, which marked the transfer of the first two batches of letters, were duly set out by the witness, and when the Attorney-General put the direct question he answered calmly that he had nothing whatever to do with the writing of the letters—that it was quite untrue he had forged them. After he was subpoenaed by Mr. Parnell's solicitors, he was visited in Ireland, so he said, by two strangers who wished to induce him to have an interview with Mr. Labouchere on behalf of Egan. He saw Mr. Parnell, Mr. George Lewis, and Mr. Labouchere, as already stated, at the house of the latter in London, and Pigott told the Court that Mr. Labouchere then offered him £1000 presumably to go into the box and denounce his statements to the *Times'* lawyers. Pigott thought this was very handsome, and on his own confession made no objection. Then there was the interview at Anderton's Hotel, in which Pigott made a

statement to Mr. George Lewis, which on production, represented in so many words that Pigott never believed the letters to be genuine. Finally the interview at Mr. Lewis's office resulted in a hot quarrel, and a correspondence in which Mr. Lewis charged Pigott with forging the letters, and the latter replied with abuse, and an accusation that there had been an attempt to bribe and entrap him. This, in brief, is the evidence which the *Times*' counsel had to put before three judges of the High Court in support of their foul charges against Mr. Parnell and his colleagues. We are willing to assume that they knew nothing as to the nature of the cross-examination which was to be made by Sir. C. Russell, though they had the assurance of Pigott himself that it would produce "serious admissions." What we ask is this—had they secured the evidence of any one of the men who, it was alleged, handed over the letters to Pigott? And if not, why not? Clearly a weak witness—weak that is in matters touching his general reputation—ought to have been supported up to the hilt in a matter of this sort by corroborative testimony. Yet it is obvious that the *Times* never got beyond Pigott, and were quite content that this precious rascal should be their "right-hand man."

And what a spectacle was presented when Sir C. Russell took in hand the forger. To begin with, Pigott wrote the word "hesitancy" with two "c's," and then it was shown how he had been in correspondence with Mr. Forster, Earl Spencer, and Sir G. Trevelyan when they were in turn at Dublin Castle, generally offering "information" for valuable consideration. But the crash was not unduly prolonged. A correspondence with Archbishop Walsh revealed the fact that three or four days before the publication of the first article on "Parnellism and Crime," in March 1887, Pigott knew what was about to happen in the *Times*' office, and offered to "point out how these designs may be successfully combatted and finally defeated." He had described these designs as being for the destruction of the influence of the Parnellite party in Parliament, and he said he could "furnish details, exhibit proofs, and suggest how the coming blow might be effectively met." Confronted with these passages, the miserable man said first that they did not refer to the incriminating letters—he had already said he knew nothing about the "Parnellism and Crime" articles—then that he supposed he must have had the letters in his mind; then that he had made an untrue statement to the Archbishop and finally that he "had not the slightest idea" what he meant in the letter. Having obtained so much from the witness, Sir C. Russell read the remainder of the letter, including these words: "I need hardly add that, did I consider the parties really guilty of the things charged against them, I should not dream of suggesting that your Grace should take part in an effort to shield them." It would be idle to follow the witness through his numerous

shuffles and evasions to get rid of this damning phrase. After a night at his hotel, with his evidence before him in the London evening papers, he was constrained to make this extraordinary explanation: "When I communicated with the Archbishop, I had obtained, as he knew, letters of a very seriously compromising kind, and I had heard that other publications in support of those letters were to be prepared. . . . That led me to write to his Grace, that he might bring me into communication with the Parnellites, or Mr. Parnell himself, with the object of inducing him to provide me with means to leave the country in return for the information that I would give them as regards the letters and how they were procured." Then Pigott had the hardihood to declare that the statements he made to the Archbishop were entirely unfounded—"they were exaggerations, not lies." Upon this he was asked to explain the meaning of his proposition to the Archbishop, and again he made a miraculous explanation to the effect that he had been shown certain compromising letters that were intended for publication; that his opinion was asked as to whether they were genuine. "I stated that I considered the Parnell letters were rather doubtful. I do not think I said they were forgeries; but believing that some of the letters were not genuine, I proposed to the Archbishop that I should tell Mr. Parnell all I knew, either to enable him to stop the publication, or to defend himself—to assist him to establish they were forgeries. I thought all the Parnell letters were not genuine, and I think the same now." Sir C. Russell completed the reading of the correspondence with the Archbishop, and it appeared further that Pigott assured Dr. Walsh that he was not the "fabricator" of the letters. A strange correspondence with Egan was next dealt with. It was alleged that in 1881, Pigott being then proprietor of the *Irishman*, was approached by two mysterious strangers, who offered him £500 to publish certain grave charges against the Land League. He was willing to withhold the publication or the statement if Egan would give him £300 in addition to a sum of £200 previously advanced to him. Egan declined the proposal. To Sir C. Russell Pigott could give no account of the strangers, save that he afterwards suspected one of them was a man named O'Sullivan, a secretary of the League. But he insisted that the story was not the creation of his imagination. Then some most damaging points were made by a demonstration of the strange similarity of certain phrases in the alleged Parnell and Egan letters with phrases in certain genuine letters sent to Pigott by the gentlemen named in 1881, when they were treating for the purchase of Pigott's newspapers. And next it came out that the word "hesitancy," spelt on the previous day by Pigott "hesitency," was written with two "e's" in one of the *Times* letters. The witness said he had heard about the misspelling in the incriminating letter, and with this in his mind he had fallen into error

on the previous day. Unfortunately for him, Sir Charles Russell produced an old letter of his in which the word was also written with two "e's." Being irritated by the extreme pressure of the cross-examination, the witness burst out into a protest against the "scandalous questions" put to him, and again denied in the most positive way that he had forged the letters. Finally, a long correspondence between Pigott and Mr. Forster, then Chief Secretary for Ireland, was put in, and the Court was highly diverted at the repeated and successful attacks made by Pigott under all sorts of pretexts upon Mr. Forster's pocket. Nobody seemed surprised to find that, when Mr. Forster had grown tired of meeting these demands, he was menaced indirectly with the exposure of his letters to Pigott.

And this was the last the Court saw of Richard Pigott. It was a Friday, and the usual adjournment was made to Tuesday. Next day (Saturday) Pigott went to the house of Mr. Labouchere, and there, in the presence of Mr. Labouchere and Mr. G. A. Sala, made a confession that all the letters, without exception, were forgeries. He had used genuine letters, which he had put against the window, so as to get a tracing upon which to work. It is true that he withdrew this confession in part when he saw Mr. Shannon (one of the *Times*' solicitors) next night, but then he admitted that he and "Murphy"—whom he now described as Patrick Casey, a well-known Nationalist—forged two of the Parnell letters, with one of O'Kelly's and one of Davitt's. When the Court reassembled on the Tuesday, Pigott was not forthcoming. He had disappeared on the previous afternoon, and the constables who had been living in the hotel with him, to see that he was not molested, could give no clue to his whereabouts. Sir C. Russell was naturally furious, and when the Attorney-General asked for an opportunity of consultation, remarked that whatever course the *Times* might take, he would, for himself, go forward, since he charged that behind Pigott and Houston there was a foul conspiracy. For the moment, however, it was necessary to let the *Times* have their way, and next day Sir R. Webster withdrew "this part of the case," with a shabby expression of regret that the letters had ever been published. It at once became evident that as far as the *Times* was concerned the game was up. For two days longer there was an effort to strengthen the evidence on other and less important branches of the inquiry, and we heard that one Mulqueeney was shown by Frank Byrne, in the rooms of the Land League at Westminster, a brown paper parcel which, according to Byrne, contained surgical knives, the suggestion being, of course, that these were the identical knives with which the Phoenix Park murders were committed. The Court subsequently adjourned for three weeks to allow Sir C. Russell and his friends to prepare the defence.

We have thought it necessary thus far to revive what is now rather



an old story, in order that the controversy which is beginning to centre round this subject may be fairly appreciated. The doings of the man who "bolted" to Madrid in the hope to escape arrest, and who blew his brains out when the Spanish authorities went to seize him, promise to colour party discussion for many days to come. The Opposition see in the complicity of the *Times* and the Government a formidable weapon of offence, and they would be more than mortal if they did not use it. The country has been profoundly moved at the injustice done to Mr. Parnell especially, and is equally impressed with the patience and dignity with which he has borne for so many months a cruel wrong. This feeling is the more pronounced since not one single prominent member of either faction of the Unionist alliance has had the decency to offer either an apology or felicitations to Mr. Parnell. A strong reaction in favour of the Irish leader has set in, and he is just now almost as much a popular hero on this side St. George's Channel as he certainly is on the other. The Kennington election, in which a Tory majority of 430 has been converted into a Liberal majority of 630, may be alleged in proof of this, although the Tories point out that at Barnsley, a few days earlier, Lord Compton's majority were some 57 less than that given to Mr. Courtney Kenny in the darkest days of 1886. Perhaps it is a fair set-off against this last, that just after the great collapse in the Commission Court, the Unionists of both sections thought it wise not to contest a vacancy at Burnley, where Mr. J. S. Balfour was returned unopposed. Burnley is not very far from Rossendale and Bury, which are represented by Lord Hartington and Sir H. James, and there was a certain wisdom in not testing the political feeling of the district at such a time. Ministers made desperate efforts to redress the balance of the account by winning the Gorton division of south-east Lancashire, and Mr. St. John Broderick, a subordinate member of the Government, went down to the constituency to remind the electors that the Government had been much more liberal in giving contracts to the local firm of Messrs. Whitworth and Co. than were their predecessors. At Govan, Mr. Stuart Wortley promised great things to the shipbuilding firms of the Clyde, but the election was not won, and we are pleased to see that the trick did not succeed in Gorton. That subordinate members of the Government should engage in this kind of electioneering is, however, extremely reprehensible; it shows very clearly the desperate straits to which the Government have been brought by recent events. *Per contra*, the spirits of the Liberal and Irish parties are daily rising; there is an aggressiveness on the Opposition benches which it does one good to see, and the cry grows louder and louder from the outside that a dissolution shall be forced at the earliest possible moment. As we write we hear of certain preparations among the members below the Opposition gangway which are ominous of coming war.

The proceedings in the House of Commons since the 21st of February, do not, happily, call for much attention. The Balfourian system of administration in Ireland was naturally reviewed on the Address, and Mr. Gladstone delivered a speech which amazed, by its force and eloquence, even those who hate him most. Mr. Chamberlain intervened to give his own version of the Round Table negotiations, of which Sir William Harcourt had spoken previously at Derby, and, from what we can gather, the member for West Birmingham is still quite willing to give Ireland Home Rule on the provincial system of Canada. He does not deny that he accepted the principle of an Irish Parliament, and an Irish administration arising out of that Parliament; and he sticks to his text that, with a previous adequate treatment of the land question, the concession of self-government might be made with little or no danger. He again appeals for the co-operation of his old friends on the land question. This speech was received with suspicion, and in certain quarters it was said to be "an appeal to be taken back again," but for ourselves we do not so read it. At the same time it is clear that the Radicals will have no sort of dealing with Mr. Chamberlain in their present temper, and that the fight must proceed. As to Mr. Balfour, he followed his common practice: first he was defiant, and then he surrendered. The indignities inflicted upon Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Harrington, and Mr. Carew were, he declared, the affair of the prison doctors—he had nothing to do with them, and would accept no responsibility concerning them. This was in debate on the Address. A few days later, on a Bill introduced by Mr. John O'Connor, the Chief Secretary suddenly found that he had never had any sympathy with the cast-iron rules which dealt alike with the hardened criminal and the poor woman who was sent to gaol because she would not vaccinate her child, and he added that he had come to the conclusion to redress the grievance by appointing a small committee of experts to inquire into the whole question. And he said, in his off-hand way, that, of course, the Irish members would not be excluded from any relaxation of existing regulations that might result. This was clever, but Mr. Morley promptly set the surrender in its true light, to the intense chagrin of the Treasury Bench, and of Mr. Balfour in particular. There need be no hesitation in accepting the suggestion that the Chief Secretary has once more been forced, either by his colleagues in the Government, or by the unofficial Tories, to conciliate public feeling, outraged by the unnecessary barbarities inflicted upon the Irish members.

We have had from the two Ministers concerned an exposition of the Government schemes of national defence. Lord George Hamilton took one's breath away by the emphasis which he placed upon his proposal to spend 21½ millions sterling in adding seventy ships to the Navy. But it is clear on reflection that this was a mere piece of "bounce"

for the benefit of the foreigner. In another year Lord Northbrook's programme will be completed, and the dockyards must continue in some sort to produce the new ships which are necessary to supply the ordinary "waste" of the Navy. The seventy ships of which so much is heard are not therefore so many additions to the normal strength of the Navy, but are in part, at any rate, necessary to keep up the Navy to its present normal strength. It follows that the 21½ millions includes the moiety of the shipbuilding vote which ordinarily goes to new constructions. As a matter of fact, we have it from Lord George Hamilton himself that the exact addition to the Navy Estimates is exactly £12,400,000. There is a special National Defence Fund of 10 millions to be spent entirely on ships put out to private contract, and a sum of £600,000 which is to be added during four years only to the amount of the shipbuilding vote which goes in the production of new vessels. To put the matter broadly, it is proposed to do rather more than twice as much in shipbuilding for four years as we have been doing. The Navy will therefore really receive an accession of strength to this extent, *plus* the extra strength of the new ships. There are to be ten battle-ships—8 of 14,000 tons, which means that they are to be more powerful than any ships we have hitherto built. And we are told that it is to be the same all through—the ships are to be of types which have been tested by experience, and what is very important, they are to receive the moment they are ready the very best equipment known to science. For the Army, Mr. Stanhope had no such imposing scheme. But he gave a good account of the preparations which are in progress to resist invasion if it should ever happen, and his statement as to the acquisition of land in the neighbourhood of Guildford and elsewhere for the purpose of constructing certain entrenched camps for the protection of the Metropolis was listened to with profound interest. This disposes of the nonsense which was talked last month as to the probable environment of London with a ring of costly forts on the Continental pattern. Such a scheme must have raised very serious opposition. Mr. Stanhope got very readily the small extra force for which he asked, and the Opposition, backed by Lord R. Churchill, will concentrate their attack upon the proposal of the First Lord of the Admiralty. There is a strong feeling that the amount of money asked for is excessive, considering that only last year Lord George Hamilton cut down the Navy Estimates, and that his subordinate, Mr. Forwood, has been protesting during many months that the Navy was practically all it should be. The great point of objection is, however, found in the fact that it is proposed to give some 12½ millions extra to an administration which has been condemned from top to bottom as hopelessly inefficient and corrupt. It will be said that the reform of the Admiralty is the first condition of a strong Navy, and with what we know of the recent record of the

department few people will deny the reasonableness of this contention.

Ireland has been fairly tranquil during the month, and the greater matters with which we have dealt have thrown into shadow such minor events as go to make up the record. Father McFadden is still before the magistrates charged with having taken part in the murder of Inspector Martin, but, spite of the scandalously frequent remands obtained by the Crown, no evidence of an incriminating character has yet been adduced against him. Meantime the Grand Jury of Donegal have thought it right to fix the criminal quality of the affair under investigation, by awarding a sum of £4000 as compensation to Mr. Martin's widow. The necessity for this haste does not appear, and it would surely have been more decent to await the result of the judicial proceedings, especially as it is probable that some at least of the members of this Grand Jury may have to examine the "bills" which may be sent up by the Crown at the next Assizes. One other thing may be mentioned as throwing a strange light upon a previous incident of which much was heard at the time. Judge Boyd, of the Irish Court of Bankruptcy, has found it possible to release a prisoner committed by him for refusing to give evidence, without the prisoner himself offering any satisfaction to the Court. Tom Moroney lay in gaol a couple of years for such an offence, and it was then said for the Government that nothing could liberate him unless he would agree to make answer in the box. It was only when his health was alleged to be suffering from the long confinement, that the Government, failing to induce Mr. Bradlaugh to move for his release on medical grounds, actually persuaded the landlord, against whom Moroney was said to have used the Plan of Campaign, to come to the rescue of the prisoner. Judge Boyd had frequently professed his inability to discharge Moroney. It appears, however, that a newspaper reporter who declines, like Moroney, to "peach" upon his friends, need be kept in prison only a few days, when the judge can, of his own motion, call him up again, and, it may be with a lecture on the absurdity of his claim to privilege, send him once more about his business. We rejoice in the action of Mr. Reeves, the Limerick reporter, the more that it has been amply justified by the result. The proceedings taken against Mr. Pierce Mahony, M.P., which it was thought to establish out of the mouth of Mr. Reeves, have been dropped, and the whole body of Irish newspaper reporters have been saved from liability to play the ignominious rôle of informer to Dublin Castle. Here again Mr. Balfour's high and mighty ways have received a well-deserved rebuke.

The position of women as members of the County Councils has been seriously attacked in the Law Courts. Mr. Beresford-Hope might perhaps have consoled himself for his defeat in the County Council election at Brixton, if he had not also failed in his attempt

to carry the Parliamentary seat for Kennington. His suit against Lady Sandhurst was indeed postponed for a week until the Kennington election had been decided, and we may therefore, without too much rashness, conclude that it is less a question of principle that Mr. Beresford-Hope wishes to establish than to give a possible satisfaction to his mortified pride. The nephew of the Prime Minister ought surely to have been more generous. During his late tour in Scotland, and more recently at Scarborough, Lord Salisbury made very significant allusion to his desire to see women wielding a more potent influence in Imperial politics, and hinted not obscurely that he was willing to concede the claim for the Parliamentary suffrage to such of the sex as were duly qualified. As the greater includes the less, we can hardly believe that Lord Salisbury, having this intention in mind, would have sanctioned an attack upon women who have passed successfully through a popular election to the County Council. The three ladies on the London Council have already won golden opinions from their colleagues, and it is said with authority that they have promptly found a *rôle* for themselves which men could not by any means so satisfactorily fill. Just now this "woman question," as it is sometimes contemptuously called, is causing an acute division among those who have long demanded female suffrage. The party is divided upon the important point whether or no women under coverture—*i.e.*, married women, shall be included in the claim to be made upon Parliament. We take it that those who are against the inclusion of married women are actuated rather by considerations of expediency, than by any strong desire to confine the vote to single women and widows. They foresee, or fancy they foresee, that Parliament will raise difficulties which may delay the concession of the vote to those who have been classed as "duly qualified." On the other hand, an equally strong, possibly a stronger, section of the friends of women's suffrage are determined that they will not so palter with the question. They insist that the vote shall be given to women exactly on the same terms as it is given to men. In two or three recent meetings of the whole party they have carried a resolution in this sense by considerable majorities, and Mr. Woodall's Bill has thus been condemned. It comes up for second reading on the 17th of April, but this is dangerously near the Easter holidays, and it is doubtful whether the House will not previously adjourn. In any case it is now pretty certain that the main body of the women's suffrage party are at issue with the bulk of their friends in Parliament.

## LAND PURCHASE :

### A PROFITABLE STATE INVESTMENT.

LAND Purchase is now a practical question in British politics. Three times in recent years it has been the subject of prolonged debates in the House of Commons. But Mr. Gladstone's Land Purchase scheme and the two Ashbourne Acts aimed only at the creation of a peasant proprietary. And although it may be safely admitted that peasant proprietary is a step in advance of dual ownership, which, not only in Ireland, but in England and Scotland as well, has been fairly tried and found wanting; still it is a false economic principle to benefit one class to the exclusion and at the expense of others. Nor would private landlordism—the present evil—be abolished. In ten or twenty years it might again be as rampant as ever, through the purchase of tenant rights by capitalists for gain. The present tenants would not become freehold owners. Most would be dead before the expiry of the period of redemption. The true principle of land purchase ought to be, that if the State buys land it must own it, not give it away; and hold it as an inalienable asset against the liability incurred. The most radical change in our Land Laws, short of State ownership and control, would only postpone the day of reckoning, not finally settle any of the complex difficulties with which the whole question is beset. Even free trade in land, advocated by many, would benefit capitalists more than agriculturists, and tend to make land a more speculative commodity, to be dealt in for profit by individuals and companies, as in America and our own colonies now. Land as a natural agent, necessary to the very existence of a nation, ought to belong to the community who live upon it, and not to any section of that community. Upon this all our standard economists are agreed in theory. The practice of private ownership is defended only upon the ground of its universal establishment, and the social derangement that would result by the overthrow of a system so deeply rooted in modern life by the usage of centuries. But it can be shown that it is not beyond the resources of statesmanship for the nation again, as of old, to acquire possession of the national soil, without any serious disorganization, social or political, by a simple though gigantic financial transaction. And further, that enormous revenue would accrue to the State

from the investment, besides great social and material benefits to the nation, otherwise unattainable under any system of private ownership. Mr. Gladstone's Land Purchase proposal for Ireland contained the germ of a sound scheme of purchase for the whole kingdom, only the purchase must be made for the State instead of the tenantry. The land itself must be the security against the payment, and remain the property of the State—the *commonwealth* of the nation, as it was before the great land holders completely in their own interest abolished the feudal tenure and created themselves owners. But the monarch, representing the State, is still by law the feudal superior over the whole land of the kingdom, and the State in purchasing requires only to buy out the rights of holders, not the full market value which a private individual might pay. In virtue of its superiority the State would buy for itself cheaper than for the tenantry.

Besides, the State can borrow cheaply upon such undoubted security. There is practically no assets against the existing National Debt beyond the annual revenue from taxation. But in buying the national soil at a reasonable valuation the nation would acquire an inalienable asset against the liability incurred, producing also an annual revenue largely in excess of the interest. For example: if an acre of land, the lettable value of which is £1 a year, is bought by the State at, say £15 (fifteen years' purchase), the State can borrow £15 at  $2\frac{1}{4}$  per cent.: the annual interest would thus be 8s. 9d., and the State receiving £1 annual rent would have a gross profit of 11s. 9d. on this one acre. Multiply this result by the number of acres in the kingdom, say, in round numbers, 50,000,000 acres arable and pasture land, and the answer shows the very handsome gross yearly profit to the State of over twenty-nine millions (£29,375,000) from its agricultural soil alone.

But all land is not of equal value. It may be safely assumed that there is now little land in the kingdom, however favourably situated or rich in soil, worth more for agricultural purposes than 30s. an acre per annum. Some land in the neighbourhood of large towns is let at more, but it is severely rack-rented because of its supposed fencing value. Again, ordinary reclaimed land, with farm buildings thereon, is worth at least 10s. an acre lettable value. The average then of the two extremes is £1 per acre overhead rental, allowing for a third each of poor, medium, and good soil, which for the purpose of illustration may be taken as a fair standard of quality of the arable land of the kingdom. But an exact and scientific valuation would require to be carefully made by entirely neutral and practical valuers, or by means of Land Courts, similar to those that have done so good work in Ireland and the Highlands, each Court being allotted a section of the country to assess the rental value of every acre of land upon its

intrinsic merits. By means of such Divisional Land Courts, the whole country could be valued simultaneously and in a comparatively short space of time; while an exact measurement and survey (where such does not already exist) could also be carried on at the same time.

Parliament is quite familiar with Compulsory Land Purchase clauses in railway and other Bills. A Compulsory Purchase Bill would be a comprehensive measure upon the same lines. Parliament would decide the price to be paid—*i.e.*, the number of years purchase, while the Land Courts or valuers would assess the rent value. Now, assuming the price fixed by the Legislature to be fifteen years' purchase (which would certainly be a fair compensation for holders' rights, when large estates have recently been sold by public auction as low as twelve years' purchase), the transfer might then at once be effected by the creation of Land Consols, and payment made to the sellers, the titles to all the purchased lands vested in the State, absolute and inalienable for all time.

The result would be approximately thus: say 50,000,000 acres purchased at an average price of £15 per acre, including all farm buildings, fencing, improvements, and vested rights of ownership:—

COST.	
50,000,000 acres at £15 per acre . . . . .	£750,000,000

REVENUE.	
50,000,000 acres at an average rental of £1 . . . . .	£50,000,000

LESS.	
$2\frac{3}{4}$ per cent. interest on £750,000,000—£20,625,000.	
$\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Sinking Fund towards reduction of Debt . . . . .	£3,750,000
	£24,375,000

Profit less expenses of collection . . . . .	£25,625,000
--	-------------

The addition of even so large an amount as £750,000,000 to the National Debt would not, when the money was soundly invested and yielding a fixed return to the nation, be a serious financial undertaking. Indeed, the State would be quite justified in creating a Note Issue (in amounts as required) for a proportion of this sum. The Bank of England and other minor note-issuing monopolies might then be abolished, and the State issue substituted. The security for such issue would be as safe, nay safer, than bullion in the cellars of the Bank of England. The national wealth would thus partly go into circulation as monetary currency, and the amount be redeemed practically every fifteen years.

The foregoing statement refers only to agricultural land. There are about 27,000,000 acres additional in the United Kingdom, which includes waste, unreclaimed, wooded, and mountain land, as well as



roads, railways, sites of towns, villages, &c. None of these would come under the foregoing arrangement. A proportion of the waste and wooded lands still remain communal property, and would not require to be purchased, while the greater proportion of waste land is quite capable of reclamation, and would be reclaimed or planted in wood, if under State control. With regard to the ground rent of cities and towns, and mining royalties, the urgency for State purchase of these has not yet arisen, although the same principle could be applied to them when occasion arose. Their purchase, however, would involve much more time, trouble, and expense, owing to the intricate systems of leasing, feuing, and sub-feuing, and the great number of small sites held by different owners, each requiring separate valuation: while the existence of large estates in this country offers special facilities for State purchase of agricultural land. But the taxation of ground rents, fees, and mining royalties (now widely advocated) would be simpler, cheaper, and quite as effective for revenue, as purchase at present extreme values. The State being unquestionably the feudal superior over these lands and royalties, requires only to reassert and impose its just claims either by a rent or tax. Such rent or tax would be imposed on unearned income, and would therefore involve no serious hardship or injustice, but, instead, more justly equalize the incidence of taxation upon industry. For it is industry which contributes the ground rents and mining royalties to private income, and receives no equivalent value in return. The communities whose industry alone has made ground rents and mining royalties valuable, are justly entitled to participate in the unearned increment. Such a tax would be more fair and just than either property or income tax—both being taxes on industry—and might go to reduce local rates.

The reletting of the national soil might be done in the first instance, either by the National Land Court, by popularly elected County Boards, or preferably by Inland Revenue officials. The work of the latter would be greatly lightened by the necessary rearrangement of our fiscal system of duties and taxes, which the new land revenue would replace; and this department could undertake the collection of the national land rent at very little additional cost to the country. Under the new order of things the old system of Land Laws would become obsolete; and in letting its soil the State would have the public good as its first and only consideration. Under any other system short of State ownership and control, private and selfish interests would prevail. The size of holdings and allotments could best be regulated by demand. To the most careless observer it must be evident, that in this as in all densely peopled countries the demand is in favour of small holdings. In France there are 5,000,000 cultivators whose average holdings do not exceed  $7\frac{1}{2}$  acres. In Prussia and Belgium small holdings also

predominate. In this country the demand is enormously in excess of the supply. Experience has demonstrated that small holdings produce much more in proportion than large ones; because extra care, thrift, and industry are bestowed upon them. If a three hundred acre farm is broken up into thirty holdings of ten acres each, worked personally by the tenants and their families, the same land will yield thirty incomes instead of two, and the real earners only receive the fruit of their industry.

The State would rent the land direct to the cultivator or user at a fixed rent, upon condition that the national property be neither destroyed nor abused. Absolute fixture of tenure may be granted to the tenant for life, or lease, or even down to his heirs, subject only to these conditions: that no land be sublet for gain; that failing heirs the feu would revert to the State to be re-let; and that if required for public purposes, compensation by neutral arbitration be paid to the tenant for permanent improvements. Such conditions would confer upon the tenants all the advantages of ownership, saving the payment of State-rent towards the reduction of taxation. Rent would be fixed according to the inherent and intrinsic value of land, and the occupant would be free to take the utmost quantity of produce, and of whatever kind that may yield the largest returns, solely for his own gain, minus only a fair rent to the nation for the use of national property. The tenant could freely improve his holding in every way, without the dread of a rapacious landlord exacting rent upon the value of his improvements. Small farms under such new and improved conditions would offer attractions to a large class outside of the present rural population. Thousands of tradesmen, shopkeepers, and commercial men from our cities, would gladly migrate to the country, and devote capital and industry to land culture, glad to escape from the anxiety, the turmoil, and vicissitudes of business to the quiet and healthful pursuits of husbandry.

Equal opportunities would be placed within the reach of all. Only the comparatively rich may purchase land, but the poorest labourer may cultivate it. From the present labour serfs who toil wearily on from day to day for the wages of bare existence, may yet—with such new conditions of independence and prosperity opened up as incentive to high endeavour—spring a race of noble and industrious yeomen cultivators as an unfailing source of inherent strength and prosperity to the nation.

How could a farm labourer, if it may be asked, with small means or none, furnish implements or stock? Give him the opportunity and he will find the means. Either the hiring or co-operative system—common in earlier days when small farming was not so rare as now—would again be found useful. Where no buildings existed, as on large farms divided into small ones, how could the poor tenant be able to build? A log cabin as on the prairies of America would

suffice the poorer class of tenants for a time, and, unused to luxury, there would be no hardship to an ex-farm-labourer or his family, whose comforts have never in this country been, in domestic arrangements, on a lavish scale. The tenant with sufficient capital would build his house and own it. The sure possession of even a small plot of a few acres of land, at a fair and fixed rent, places a man in a position of true independence, and always at least beyond the possibility of want. For land is the storehouse from which all wealth is by labour drawn.

In the neighbourhood of populous centres it would be necessary to reserve ground for feuing purposes, which might be temporarily leased for market gardens. The demand for cottage and villa sites in the vicinity of large towns is a growing one. For such land, held by private owners, an annual feudity of from £20 to £100 an acre is demanded, or a yearly charge of many times the purchase value of the ground (for agricultural purposes). By reserving 1,000,000 acres over the country, for ultimate feuing into 4,000,000 quarter-acre sites, breathing space would be left for the healthy development and expansion of our great towns into the country, as well as a source for improved revenue. While also, under a liberal system of allotments, large numbers of our present urban population would migrate back to rural life, from which vast numbers within recent decades have been either driven or attracted into the towns.

Under an equitable division of the soil into about two millions of different-sized holdings (say from five to a hundred acres) our country would become a veritable garden, and be cultivated to its utmost capacity. With fair rents and stimulated enterprise, together with lower rates of inland carriage, the small cultivator would be enabled to compete successfully against foreign food importations. Of meat, butter, cheese, eggs, poultry, fruit and vegetables, we import £50,000,000 value annually, besides an equal amount in value of cereals and flour. In the profitable production at home of even a portion of these imports there lies an immense source of prosperity for our farmers. Intelligent enterprise and improved modes of culture will overcome many apparent difficulties. Science is probing deeper and deeper into Nature's secrets every year, and there are yet vast developments in store for agriculture. Under State control there would be no impediments to enlightened and intelligent enterprise. Land cultivation in all its manifold branches would become a practical science. The old-fashioned (because handicapped) easy-going routine of farming would give place to a higher and nobler system, where every branch of physical science would be brought into practical use. Technical education, as applied to land culture, will give the future cultivators of our soil pre-eminent advantages over the old race of farmers. Hand and brain must unite to produce. And as land culture is the most ancient, so may it yet become,

under such conditions for free expansion, and by a gradual evolution of progress, one of the most honourable and lucrative of professions.

From such a scheme, of land purchase not only would the tenants benefit, but the whole nation, as well, would receive immediate and increasing benefit in enormously reduced taxation, in reciprocal prosperity, resulting from the largely increased number of cultivators—real wealth producers—and in the general and wider distribution of earned wealth among all classes of workers. An extensive and permanent home market for our own manufactures would be created by the increased number of industrial cultivators of the soil, stimulated to work by the certainty of receiving the full reward of their industry and enterprise. Every branch of commerce would be animated by new and healthy vigour, and every class would participate in the common prosperity.

## MODERN SCIENCE IN BIBLE LANDS.<sup>1</sup>

THE connection between physical geography and history is a subject worthy of close attention, but, perhaps, the difficulties of the study, and the very extensive information required, as well as the necessary union of two qualities seldom found in the same person, have hitherto deterred scholars from attempting the task. Dean Stanley's valuable work on Sinai and Palestine is a partial contribution to the subject, and this book by Sir William Dawson is written with the avowed purpose of upholding and illustrating the history of the Bible, by an examination of the physical features of Bible lands, of Egypt and Palestine, and of the coasts of the Mediterranean generally. The book is somewhat pretentious, and the author takes science in a wide application, and includes a discussion regarding the origin and development of civilization. In such a discussion he must necessarily touch upon some of the subjects most debated at the present time. In the chapters on "Early Man in Genesis" and "The Structure and History of Palestine," he has gathered information which is interesting, if not always trustworthy; but in his wider treatment of his subject he evidently lacks those qualities which are essential in either a judicious scientist or a faithful historian.

Truth is, or ought to be, the one object at which a scientist or a historian must aim. If he should go to the study of his subject with preconceived opinions, or with prejudices already formed, his researches will not be of that independent character which can alone make them valuable, and this not least in regard to any scientific expositor of Bible lands, or any research into Bible history. But this spirit of independent research Sir William Dawson does not possess. It seems scarcely conceivable that at this time of day, in this learned and liberal nineteenth century, there are minds so narrow and so weak that they are unable to love truth for its own sake, and have so little confidence in the wisdom and consistency of God in all his works, that they are afraid to search deeply either into the problems of science or into the lessons of history, lest they should find some inconsistency in what they believe to be God's purpose—minds unable to appreciate the great spiritual and moral

<sup>1</sup> *Modern Science in Bible Lands.* By Sir J. W. Dawson, LL.D., F.R.S. With illustrations, crown 8vo. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1888.

lessons of Scripture unless these are supported by the complete infallibility of its scientific and historical teaching also. But Sir William is one of these, and he has gained some popularity as the champion of orthodoxy. He is not a vigorous thinker, and even in his own special department of study he does not hold a high place; but when he ventures beyond this he immediately betrays the meagreness of his information, both in quantity and in quality. He does not consult original authorities, but gains his knowledge at second-hand, and certainly not from the most trustworthy sources; while, in straining after some illustration to corroborate or elucidate his views of Scripture, he is both crude and puerile. Sir William rejects with unfeigned contempt the Elohistic and Jahevistic views of modern critics, but as he cannot deny the fact that there is an evident difference in parts of the Pentateuch, he feels it necessary to propound a theory so original that it must be given in his own words. "It seems that Cain and Abel were already representatives of two types of religion—that of the worship of God as creator, and that of a coming Redeemer, and we are not surprised afterwards to hear that the Sethites began to call and evoke the name of Jahveh, and the Cainites Bene ha Elohim. The two tribes were respectively the Christians and the Deists of their day. . . . The one, Jahveh, was the name specially venerated by the Sethites, and the other, Elohim, by the Cainites." And he implies, if he does not expressly maintain, that the employing the two distinct terms does not betoken two distinct narrators, but rather the one narrator kindly accommodating himself to the feelings of one or the other party—the Cainites or Sethites. This new theory has the merit of being amiable, and no one is likely to dispute its originality. When Sir William has in view to defend the infallibility of the Bible, or rather his opinions in regard to it, no theory is too absurd for his purpose, and he never seems to realize that such puerilities do incalculable harm to the cause he is defending. But a large part of the book is devoted to the solution of the question as to the antiquity of civilization, and as this is the most important part, and as the subject is one of very deep interest, and as our views differ entirely from those held by Sir William, we propose in this paper to give the grounds on which we have arrived at a conclusion so opposed.

It is well to notice that Sir William has receded from the position which he formerly held. He now admits the antiquity of man, though, when the slightest occasion offers, he, with a painful want of decision, still makes an effort to regain and defend the position he has been forced to yield. He holds, however, that the deluge swept away the whole human race with the exception of the family in the ark. Accepting the verdict of Lenormant that the tradition of the deluge is universal, Sir William concludes that the deluge was itself

universal, and that the household of Noah alone escaped the terrible cataclysm. In maintaining this, however, he is not always consistent, for he afterwards suggests that possibly the negro may be descended from an antediluvian race. But the deluge is made the starting-point, or the limit, behind which no history of civilization can go, though he says that it is quite possible that language and the rudiments of civilization may have been inherited from the antediluvians. He, however, does not give us any idea of this inherited language, nor of the degree of civilization which had been reached prior to the deluge. In his further treatment of the subject he accepts the chronology of our Bible, and evidently regards it as equally important with the text itself; he therefore maintains that 3000 years is the utmost limit to which the history of civilization can be extended. Our readers will scarcely require to be reminded that there are three leading chronological tables of Bible history, of the Masoretic Hebrew text, of the Septuagint, and of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and that the table of our English version is formed from a comparison of these tables made by Bishop Usher. But these tables were framed at times wholly uncritical, when earnest research was unknown, and when very few of the means which we now possess for forming a correct estimate were even dreamt of; and these tables differ so much from one another that they destroy each other's value. Sir William naturally turns to Egypt as presenting the earliest form of civilization, and he admits that the Pyramids give evidence of a civilization somewhat advanced, and imply a large population, but he suggests that the civilization may have been inherited from the antediluvians, and that the large population is not astonishing, since, in a comparatively short time, the population of the United States has reached sixty millions. We are unwilling to accuse Sir William of disingenuousness, but we are driven to the other conclusion that he is utterly ignorant of the subject, on which, however, he does not hesitate to express a very dogmatic opinion. Surely he must see that there can be no parallelism between the circumstances by which the United States have reached their large population and the circumstances in which a country was placed in times virtually prehistoric. Into the United States all Europe, in fact, the whole world, has been pouring its surplus population; but at the times of the Pyramids there could be no surplus population to pour into Egypt. Certainly, the data on which we might be expected to form an estimate of the antiquity of civilization are not so full or so definite as we might desire—the circumstances of the case do not permit it; yet, in the monuments and other remains found not only in Egypt but in other countries, also, we possess most valuable materials which throw much light on the subject. Manetho, an Egyptian, and a scribe in the temple at Thebes in the third century before Christ, wrote in Greek a history

of Egypt. This has, unfortunately, been lost; but Josephus and others have preserved some extracts from his book, including a list of dynasties with a large proportion of the names of kings. According to his calculation, a period of 5366 years intervened between the founding of the kingdom by Menes and the last year of Nectenebo, or 340 years before Christ. Herodotus gives 346 generations from Menes to the conquest by Cambyses, and Diodorus has a list of 476 kings for the same period. The Turin Papyrus also gives a list of kings, but it is, unfortunately, in a very dilapidated state, and is only valuable as it serves to supplement the lists. Between these lists there are discrepancies which, though not after all very great, are yet sufficient to diminish their value. But we have not to depend on these alone, for we have lists from Karnak, from Saqqarah, and from the greater and lesser temples at Abydos. In each of these cases the reigning king is represented as offering incense, or doing homage to his ancestors, and we may be sure that he would carefully ascertain the legitimacy of the claims of each to the throne; and so we find that in these lists the kings from the twelfth to the eighteenth dynasty—the Hyksos kings—are omitted, as they were always regarded as foreigners and usurpers. But besides these lists of kings there are lists of Court architects, forming a continuous list from Seti to Darius, and these confirm in a very remarkable manner the lists of kings for the same period. But the lists, both of the kings and of the Court architects, for this latter period from Seti, confirm very exactly the lists of Manetho for this same period, and must strengthen our confidence in his lists of the earlier periods also. From a comparison of all these lists we have from Seti, the second king of the nineteenth dynasty, to the birth of Christ, a period of 1558 years. This may be regarded as determined with perfect certainty. From Seti to Menes, omitting the Hyksos kings, we have sixty-five reigns, and, if we take the average durations of the reigns from Seti to Darius as our guide, we have a period of 2166 years, and allowing 500 years for the five dynasties of the Hyksos period we have  $1558 + 2166 + 500 = 4224$  years as the whole period from Menes, the founder of the monarchy, to the birth of Christ. Brugsch gives 4455 and Mariette 5004 years for the same period, and Sayce adopts Mariette's figures. These three scholars are the highest authorities on Egyptian history, careful and judicious in their researches and calculations. But the establishment of the monarchy by Menes is not by any means the beginning of Egyptian history: there must have been a period during which the Egyptian nation was forming itself. No nation has ever presented the same staid immobile character as the Egyptians. This is a remarkably striking feature and may be observed in the earliest representations. But this could only have been acquired after a lengthened period. The Egyptians claimed for themselves a very long period



prior to Menes. Manetho gives a list of Gods, Demigods, and Heroes covering a period of 24,000 years, while Bunsen calculates that not less than 10,000 years was necessary in order to afford the opportunity for the Egyptians to arrive at the degree of civilization they had reached at the founding of the monarchy. We attach little importance to either of these calculations: the first are essentially mythical, and Bunsen attempts definiteness where no definiteness is possible; yet, as Sayce very judiciously remarks regarding Manetho's mythical characters, "These founders are figures like those of living men, but grander, greater, and nearer the immortal. They are not empty creatures of the fancy, but in them the actual deeds of the earlier ages are personified and endowed with life." It is quite evident that there must have been a period before Menes, and this by no means a short period, during which society was forming itself, when the lines which separate the social classes from one another were being drawn, when art and religion and language were being developed. Though we may not be able to assign dates to that early prehistoric period, we cannot fail to be convinced that it must have taken a very long time for that early civilization to have developed itself. We have to deal not with years, but with cycles; not with individual events, but with developments which are naturally slow. We have, for instance, no means of assigning dates for the growth of language, but as in geology we use terms which are exceedingly elastic, and which are expressive not so much of times as of states and conditions of the earth's crust—such terms as Eocene, Miocene, and Pliocene—so in regard to language we may use terms which point out the condition of a language and its growth. Languages may be classified according to these conditions, and regarded as stratified in these conditions. Words are the expression of individual conception, and these conceptions must exist before we can expose them. As, at first, conceptions may be simple and crude, so the terms in which these conceptions are expressed must be also simple and crude: only with the growth of ideas, with the increase of knowledge, with the more extended requirements of social life do our conceptions become enlarged and more complex. But with this development of civilization comes the development of language; the one must keep pace with the other; language cannot anticipate this development of civilization. But in this development it becomes necessary to express shades of meaning and the relation of ideas to one another, and so language assumes changed forms, and grammar is the law according to which these forms are determined. But it is a very remarkable fact that all the languages are petrified in the earliest forms in which they are known to us, and have undergone no change since. They may possibly have added to their vocabulary, but they have undergone no change in form. Egyptian became inevitably stratified in the form pre-

sented by the earliest monuments, and, if we may borrow a term from geology, it is stratified in the earlier Miocene period—the period which Schleicher would distinguish as the period when the roots of ideas were developed, and never reached the confixative state—the state in which the roots of connection are formed. But there was no change in the language from the period of the earliest monuments till the Ptolemies. As early as the establishment of the monarchy, upwards of 4000 B.C., it was in a state as perfect as it was at any future time. The development of the language must therefore have taken place in that indefinite period between the separation of the Egyptian from the Semitic stem, and the founding of the kingdom under Menes. We say Semitic stem, for we hold that it is Semitic. Sir William calls it Turanian, and he may be allowed the full merit of the new discovery. We are quite aware that Renan, and after him Renouf, are unwilling to classify it with the Semitic, on account of its imperfect development, and would prefer to call it Khamitic, or Prehistoric-Semitic. But this does not impair its legitimate descent from the Semitic. We think that Rawlinson is wrong in saying that its grammar is predominantly Semitic, but if the roots of a language can guide us in placing it, there can be no doubt in determining the Semitic character of the Egyptian. Any development of the language must then have taken place in the interval between the separation between the parent stem in the plains of Central Asia and the earliest of the Egyptian monuments, and after this period it underwent no change. It was in this interval that the language and the civilization slowly developed themselves; we say slowly advisedly, for the changes in a nation's development are only hastened by the introduction of foreign elements. and such foreign elements were not likely to have hastened the progress of the Egyptian. At the time of Menes the language was not in its infancy, not even in its youth, and had already entered on a period of decay.

But language may exist in oral form, and never be committed to writing, for writing is purely accidental and artificial. Like language, however, writing does not spring at once into perfect form, it passes through progressive stages: there is first the ideogrammatic, then the syllabic, and finally the alphabetic, or the phonetic, stage. But here, again, it is important to note the fact that in the earliest of the monuments the writing is already alphabetical. It still retained its ideogrammatic character, but it had reached the alphabetic stage, and in this form it was accepted by the Phœnicians and conveyed by them to the Greeks and other European nations. In Papyri, some of which it is claimed belong to the second dynasty, we have even a cursive form of writing, called hieratic. As in the case of the language, so of the writing also, it had reached its highest development at the earliest period, the establishment of the monarchy.

It must, therefore, have been developed in that indefinite prehistoric period which we most reckon by cycles and not by years. But writing is never developed when a nation is in the nomadic stage: not till it has settled permanently in a home, not till it has gathered a store of oral traditions, is writing or literature developed; and in the medical papyrus at Berlin we have reference to a medical literature of the first dynasty. Egyptian writing must then have been developed between the founding of the monarchy and the settlement in Egypt. But the Egyptian religion and government, as well as art, present facts equally remarkable with what we find in reference to language and writing. We accept the verdict of Brugsch, of J. de Rougé, and of Robiou, that the original form of the Egyptian religion was undoubtedly monotheistic, though we cannot agree with Robiou in thinking that it continued monotheistic till the period of the second dynasty. Before the establishment of the monarchy mythical elements had grown up around the original type. The oldest known papyrus of the Book of the Dead only dates back to the eighteenth dynasty; but the sacred ritual preserved in it belongs to a period very much earlier, for extracts from it are found on sarcophagi and in tombs of the earliest dynasties, and there is a reference to it in the Prisse Papyrus, as if to an old and well-known ritual. On the site of old Memphis, and near the Sphinx, there were lately unearthed some ruins evidently of a very early period, and which have been recognized as the remains of an old temple of Isis. From records of Cheops, the builder of the great Pyramid, we learn that he had discovered at Memphis the ruins of an earlier city, and especially of a temple of Isis. The ruins lately discovered are believed to be the same as were discovered by Cheops, confirming the view that Memphis was built on the site of a city still earlier. The existence of such a temple carries the religion of the Egyptian very far back; but every student of mythology knows that the mythology of each nation has been developed after its separation from its kindred tribes, and this is especially true regarding the mythology of Egypt: it is indigenous to the banks of the Nile. Bunsen remarks that "Egyptian mythology could have developed nowhere else but under an African sky, and the overpowering influence of a solar symbolism." And we may be allowed to add that it is as strongly marked by the peculiar features of the fertilizing Nile. If the religious system of the Egyptians was very complex it was still very well developed and of great excellence; it was a religious system which presented a very pure morality, which clearly taught of a future life of rewards and punishments, and which, in its ritual, addressed the supreme God by that name so dear to every Christian—of Father; a religious system to which the Hebrew system was very deeply indebted, from which it borrowed very many of its precepts, and copied much of its ritualistic service

as well as many of its temple forms, and the mode of its priestly garments with their rich Eastern ornamentations, a religious system, in fact, as much older than the Hebrew as the language and the writing of the Egyptians exceeded in age by many centuries, the language and writing of the Phœnicians or the Hebrews.

A study of Egyptian art still further confirms our view of the very great antiquity of Egypt's civilization. Only one who has visited Egypt can form any idea of the massiveness of its ancient structures, and the artistic merit of its architecture. Its tombs excavated for acres, and the walls of which are covered with well-cut bas-reliefs, or with brilliant paintings, which reveal the social life of the period; its magnificent temples, built of massive blocks and adorned with majestic columns and beautiful caryatides; its gigantic pyramids, built with wonderful symmetry and in strict obedience to the laws of art; the Sphinx, which for ages has remained so expressive of mysterious majesty; its obelisks, so gracefully pointing heavenwards—all speak of a wonderful development of art and culture, yet breathe the air of a far distant past. We quote the very highest authority on the subject, Sir James Ferguson:—"We are startled to find Egyptian art nearly as perfect in the oldest pyramids as in any of the later, or as it afterwards became when all the refinement and all the science of the Greeks had been applied to its elaboration. Even at the earliest period the Egyptians had attained the art of transporting the heaviest blocks of granite from Syene to Memphis, of squaring them with a mathematical precision never surpassed, of polishing them to a surface as smooth as glass, and of raising them higher than any such blocks have ever been raised in any other building in the world, and setting them with a truth and precision so wonderful that they now lie without flaw or settlement after thousands of years have passed over them, and swept the more modern buildings of other nations from the face of the earth, or laid them in undefinable and indiscriminate ruin. At that early period, too, the art of sculpture was as perfect as it ever afterwards became; the hieroglyphics are as perfectly cut, as beautifully coloured, and told their tale with the same quaint distinctness which afterwards characterized them." Indeed, it is very remarkable that the oldest monuments are not only the most massive, but show the most artistic taste. After the twentieth dynasty there is a very perceptible decline both in the art and size of materials of the buildings; down to the twentieth dynasty they are of the hard granite or syenite from the Upper Nile, but after that period they are of the more easily worked and less beautiful sandstone of the Lower Nile. But it is not only in the more massive buildings that this very wonderful artistic merit appears: it is, also, in small objects, as trinkets and jewellery, which possess great artistic beauty. The argument in favour of a great antiquity of civilization, especially in

regard to Egypt, is of a very accumulative character, and still other facts disclose themselves to us. We learn that at the time of the earliest monuments the population was divided not only into different social classes, but into the different trades and occupations, into the military and priestly orders, and also the agricultural and manufacturing and trading classes. Indeed, Egyptian civilization seems to have been at once many-sided and highly developed, the position of the several classes being remarkably well defined. But the very existence of these social distinctions, and of the various occupations, must have necessitated laws and government which might afford security, not only to life, but to the requirements of society, to the various industries, to the development of trade and commerce. In fact, a settled state of society implies that the obligations and responsibilities of the several classes must have been fully recognized before there could have been any real development. The peculiar character of agriculture in Egypt seems to have required from the very first a well-regulated administration and a close and careful supervision. The soil of Egypt owes its great fertility to the overflowing of the Nile, but in order to take full advantage of this peculiar feature a canal and dyke system has been at all times necessary. Classical writers, as Herodotus and Eratosthenes, allude to the wonderful system of artificial irrigation in Egypt, and to the lakes and canals which had been formed to retain the waters of the receding river. But tradition places the origin of this system at a very early date, long before the establishment of the monarchy, and late researches have tended to verify this tradition. There is every reason to believe that the government by nomes, or districts, grew out of this system of irrigation. Each nome seems early to have felt the necessity of looking after its own interests, and to have begun a system of irrigation to meet its requirements. The nomes existed long prior to any historic period, and each exercised its own independent government, apparently in the patriarchal form. There were forty-two of these nomes, each quite distinct from the others. Bunsen concludes that these nomes existed separately 6000 years before Menes, but Bunsen's dates are largely imaginative, and, yet, we must acknowledge that he was very learned, generally judicious, and thoroughly honest in all his researches. After a time these nomes combined, and later still they became united into separate kingdoms, the one of Upper and the other of Lower Egypt. Under Menes, or rather under an unknown predecessor, the kingdom of Upper Egypt was reduced to subjection by the king of Lower Egypt, and the kings of this united kingdom always after bore the double title of Upper and Lower Egypt, and wore the double crown.

From the facts which we have considered, we are led to the conclusion that the civilization of Egypt carries us back to a very remote period. The establishment of the monarchy cannot have been less than 4000 years before Christ, but this rests upon a previous period,

which we are not able to define, and regarding which we can only say that then the Egyptian language and writing, art and religion, society and government, were being developed. We are confident too that the scene of this development must have been the Nile valley. The writing, and especially the religion, and the system of government bear too strongly the impress of the peculiar features of the country to admit any doubt of this. We are not inclined to attempt assigning any dates to this prehistoric period, for it cannot possibly be done. The prehistoric development must have been slow, and we can only repeat that we must calculate it by cycles and not by years. But we must bear in mind that when we have marked the origin of that distinct Egyptian development we have only reached one lengthened stage backward in the history of the Egyptian people. Though the Egyptian language never reached great perfection, for it early became stratified in what we may call the Miocene state, between the monosyllabic and the confixative, yet there is enough to assure us that it is of the Semitic branch, and we are carried back to the home of the Semitic family in Central Asia; we have to watch the growth of the Semitic people till they became numerous and formed themselves into separate tribes; we have to notice the development of distinct dialects; we have to trace the successive advance from the rudest state to the nomadic, the pastoral, and there is reason to believe the earlier forms of agricultural life. Then we must follow them in their migrations till their settlement in Egypt. Sir William Dawson displays a most lamentable ignorance when he assigns one generation to the period between the flood and the establishment of the Egyptian monarchy. We think that we have shown the utter absurdity of such an idea. We have confined ourselves to the development of Egyptian civilization, because this is the field that Sir William has chosen, but the development of other nations of antiquity reveals very similar facts. The Aryans, and especially the Indians or Sanskrit-speaking people, at a very early period developed civilizations essentially different from that of the Egyptians, yet equally remarkable.

The Indians were the last to leave the home of the Aryan family; they had seen the Celts, and Teutons, and the Græco-Italic tribes leave, and turn their faces westward, before they, in company with the Persians, directed their course to the East. From the first book of the *Zendavesta* we learn that the combined Indians and Persians travelled north-east, but later turned towards the Himalayas. These migrations must have occupied a long time, for the *Vendidad* mentions sixteen lands which they visited, and where they made lengthened sojourns, for linguistic deposits from this Indo-Persic migration are still discernible. The quarrel which resulted in the separation of the Indians and Persians took place after the passage of the Himalayas, yet subsequently to this period the Indians and

the Persians each developed their respective systems, which are in every respect very different from one another, but which, nevertheless, appear in their most perfect form in the earliest of the Vedas, and in the Avesta. In the earliest of the Vedas the Sanskrit language, with its remarkably full and perfect grammar, is in its highest development—a development only compatible with the highest civilization; but the language of the Vedas had already become hieratic in its character and had ceased to be the common language of the people. The language also of the Avesta, the Zend, was a dead language in the time of Alexander. Here again we have to do with cycles during which the civilization of the Indians or the Persians was developed—a civilization which was already effete at the time of the composition of the Vedas or of the Avesta, if we may judge from the language as well as from the character of these works respectively. In whatever direction we study the development of the Semitic or the Aryan nations, we cannot fail to be impressed with the antiquity of their civilization, and we cannot accept those chronological tables which assign a limited period to this development and which are based on data utterly inadequate.

## NATIONAL FESTIVALS :

### THE COMMEMORATION OF THE DEATH OF BAUDIN.

THE recent recognition by the French Republic of the 2nd December as a national festival founded upon the memory of Baudin, as the representative of those who fought and fell for civil liberty against a personal despotism reared on a breach of faith, ought to be an emblem of hope for Irish patriotism. For it represents the triumph of the sacred right of constitutional resistance Baudin and his friends were defending, not attacking, the constitutional barricades of popular rights against their invasion by that subtle modern form of despotism which, under the cloak of law and public safety, sought to undermine them. Napoleon had been elected and had sworn to preserve Republican liberty. He found that constitutional rule was difficult and burdensome, as it must be. He listened to the bourgeois shrieks against advanced politicians which are so common to all "comfortable men." He found how socially popular it was to flatter and patronize the innate despotic tendencies of military men and military-minded police. He found that power can always attract a certain class of covetous men, the hangers-on of Courts; that representative forms of Government, if kept well in hand and skilfully manipulated, can be turned to despotic account; that the "liberty of the press" can be corrupted where it cannot be coerced. He, as other despots have done, played with and fostered the prejudices of the masses as well as of the classes. The agricultural peasants could be cajoled by promises of plenty and peace, and the traders by hopes of peaceful plenty. The military classes could be attracted by visions of Napoleonic glory; the millinery classes by Court splendour. Napoleon III. was a Tory democrat *in excelsis*. He could carry a *coup d'état* under the cry of "Law and Order." He could get his insidious breach of faith whitewashed by a "popular" *plébiscite*. Democracy can too often be manipulated if a wily politician is on the watch to foster its prejudices and to appeal to its pride and passion.

Such a democracy has its reward. It ceases by its wrongful acts to be true democracy, and becomes the slave of a demagogic master until the truth shall make it free. We have seen, are seeing, the same process in England. Englishmen have been cajoled by appeals



to national vanity, to the national pocket, to national prejudices, to sanction coercion in Ireland in the name of "Law and Order." "No Irish need apply" was an insidious appeal to the selfishness of the English workman. "Will not a Home Rule Government protect Irish manufacture to the exclusion of English?" is an equally vile appeal to the pockets of English traders. A wave of the Union Jack with a shout for "the integrity of the empire" is enough to evoke the intemperate Jingoism of the military classes. In England, too, to make Trafalgar Square a desert for the convenience of the sleek society shopman, or to break up a Socialist procession, or to smash a Salvation band, is hailed by the bourgeoisie as a triumph of government. The national celebration of a Baudin's death is the triumph of a true democracy which refuses to be cajoled, corrupted, or coerced. Baudin, in the name of liberty, leapt upon the barricade waving a red flag, to make his one protest against the suppression of constitutional government in the name of "Law and Order." He was shot down by the police. The *coup d'état* was founded upon a Michelstown massacre. The people had a right to assemble to protect themselves and their liberties when threatened with destruction by a breach of faith on the part of those in power. In their excitement, instigated by the violence of the police and the military, they had undoubtedly killed a general, General Brea. But who was responsible for causing the General to be so hated and brought to such an untimely end but he who had authorized the violent action of the officials? Just in the same way, Constable Leahy was wrongfully injured at Michelstown, Dr. Ridley wrongfully attacked, and Inspector Martin brutally murdered at Gweedore. The man who is truly responsible for the worrying to death of the one, the injury of the other, and the murder of the third, is the man under whose policy each was put into a false and hateful position. The victims of an infuriated people are the victims of a vile policy which has wrongfully infuriated the people. General Brea was the victim, as well as Baudin, of the Napoleonic breach of faith, just as Dr. Ridley as well as Mandeville, Leahy as well as the old man Denver, Martin as well as Father M'Fadden, are the victims of Balfourian policy in Ireland, a policy equally founded on a breach of faith to the electorate of 1886.

But to return to Baudin and the object lesson which his fate has for us. Baudin was hustled into his unmarked grave. For seventeen years he lay there undistinguished. Napoleon doubtless forgot that he had lived or died. "The Empire meant peace." But in 1868 a little band of faithful Republicans determined to revive Baudin's memory by commemorating his death beside his grave on the 2nd December. Noted names appear in the memorial on this behalf. Arago, Cremieux, Floquet, Gróvy, Jules Ferry, Challemer-Lacour, Victor Hugo, are among the number, as also Delescluze, the editor of the *Reveil* and chief organizer of the scheme. The Government

ordered a prosecution of the promoters before a police tribunal without a jury. An Imperialist Irremovable, M. Vivian, presided. The *Reveil* was seized. The military were paraded in force to hold the cemetery and to suppress any demonstration. The proceeding recalls the many recent instances to prevent similar demonstrations over memorials to Allen and Larkin. Had Napoleon silenced the disturbers of his peace? No! For the young lawyer, the debater of the clubs, Gambetta, was to defend the editor Delescluze.

It is to some of the striking sentences of Gambetta in this his famous defence to which our attention may well be directed at the present time. "For then," as a little pamphlet recently published in France says, "for the first time the Empire, habituated to silence, heard these accents which seemed to rise from the tomb of its victims like the voices of the spectres accusing Richard III." Within two years of their utterance the Empire crumbled to pieces on the field of Sedan.

"What is the question before us?" asks Gambetta. "It is this. Can there exist some particular moment in the life of a nation, embosomed in the midst of civilized society, at which either for reasons of State or for the sake of a blow to be struck by the State, the law can be violated and the constitution reversed by the State authorities with impunity, and those who defend them at the peril of their lives can be treated as criminals on the plea of public safety?" This is the same question, in other words, as that which the English Commonwealth answered—namely, Can the Royal prerogative override the law on the ground of public safety?

"It was not a mere question of the right of the memorialists to meet at Baudin's grave; nor of the supposedly seditious speeches which it was alleged by the police they might make. No! it was because those who proposed so to meet were prominent personalities who might influence public opinion, and because they were to meet in memory of a man who had contested the prerogative of the State to override the law." Even so Messrs. Dillon, O'Brien, Blunt, Harrington, and others have been silenced by proclamations on the plea of danger to the public peace by the meetings summoned to hear them, but really on the ground that they were "prominent personalities" in influencing public opinion on the subject of agrarian reform or national independence.

"Ah!" cries Gambetta, "it is not enough to have chased Republicans out of the Republic! You wish further to oust them out of the pale of humanity! (Is that your meaning in attempting to deprive Baudin's memory of the veneration of his friends?) No! the real truth is that you knew the sentiments of these men now prosecuted here. You knew that behind their sorrows lay not merely the sentiments of friends but the feelings of patriots; and therefore, fearing lest the example of these men, whose consciences

you knew had never slept, should chance to awaken the public conscience, you said, 'We must prevent the exhumation of these spectres from their graves. We must cut short this terrible review of the past.' And you prosecute those who by the very prominence of their names have the reputation of having always lived and fought for the same principles and of having remained the unbroken defenders of the same flag."

As for M. Delescluze personally—"You accuse him of having under all Governments, even under that of the Republic of 1848, striven against reactionaries. As if that were not to bestow on him the greatest praise for his devotion to his principles! You call such a man the apologist of assassins! He who for forty years had given to France his life of devotion in exchange for the distress and misery which had thereby fallen to his lot. You would overwhelm such a man with calumnies. *It is thus, often, that a just man and a martyr dies with the reputation of a rascal, and that is what his persecutors call 'forming a public opinion!'*" The application of this to the abortive attempt of the *Times* to overwhelm Mr. Parnell, not by argument but by calumny, is singularly apt. Then, again, there comes a fine retort to the plea brought against Delescluze, as against many Irish editors and orators, of condoning outrage merely because he had boldly and openly protested against men, however weightily charged with complicity with murder and outrage through political motives, being tried before military and irregular tribunals. "As a proof that vengeance, not justice, was your aim, you did not send those assassins, as they were called, before a jury. You refused them what was their natural right and due guarantee. You conceived a retrogressive military system of jurisdiction which continued civil war and prolonged the social duel after the real fight had been fought and disarmament had taken place. By sending those workmen in 1848 to be condemned to death by military tribunals you re-erected the scaffold which the Revolution of 1848 shattered. That and nothing more was what Delescluze had asserted. For that you call him an apologist of assassins." We know how men who claim a fair trial, a full defence, and a free jury for every one charged with a crime in Ireland are looked on as accomplices in crime; yet what they claim are the very elements on which law and justice grow strong. These and such like accusations were mere calumnies to bear down under their weight the real issue which Gambetta reasserts in more directly applicable language—namely, "whether the authority which had been produced by the generous Revolution of 1848 and was the depository of that Revolution's trust, under the binding force of a unique and solemn oath, had been gratuitously entrusted with a providential mission, I know not from whence, to beat down the very form of government which it had been charged to protect and which had but just been

founded amidst the acclamations of the country. . . . Never, never, have I come across in history a clearer duel between Right and Force. The 2nd December was no mere record of bloody and sorrowful deeds. What have to be recorded are the machinations, the evil consequences brought upon France, the trouble wrought on the political conscience by such a ruthless attack." For who were the men who grouped themselves round the Pretender of December 2nd? "They were men who up to that time France knew not, men who had neither talent, nor honour, nor rank, nor position. Men of that class who at all epochs are the accomplices of Force; of whom one can repeat what Sallust said of the troupe gathered round Catiline, or what Cæsar said himself in tracing the portraits of his comrades, the eternal outcasts of orderly societies, 'un tas d'hommes perdus de dettes et de crimes.'\* It is with such a personelle that for ages men have sabred laws and institutions; upon whom the human conscience is powerless to react, in spite of the sublime succession of Socrateses, Ciceros, Catos, of thinkers and martyrs who have raised their protests against the deeds of such men in the name of religion immolated, of morality sore stricken, of right crushed under the booted heel of the soldier." These men had pretended to have saved France. But a nation when in trouble turns to those it knows and trusts to save it. Where were those it knew and trusted on December 2nd? Thiers? De Remusat? Ledru Rollin? and many others? "Those who would defend the law were already at the prisons of Mazas, or Vincennes, or *en route* to Cayenne!" "These men of December had seized upon the country, had enchained its liberty by making use of the new means of communication and resource which science had placed at their disposal. Centralization and terror accomplished their design. They deceived Paris through the provinces. They deceived the provinces through Paris. Steam and telegraphy became the instruments of power. They sent word through the provinces that Paris had submitted! Submitted? why it had been assassinated! Submitted? Why they had fusilladed and mitrailleused it." And then follows a unique specimen of pathetic sarcasm. "I who speak to you, I too had friends, who were killed on coming out of the School of Law [L'Ecole de Droit]. They were without arms. Truly they were very wrong and imprudent, very blameworthy, to have come to hear about law and rights in a country where they were respected after this fashion."

To the argument that the deeds of the 2nd December were done by the national will Gambetta retorted, "Could it be that the national will of a people had employed Force to overthrow its own legality and rights and to destroy itself!" The answer to the appeal of the Napoleonists to their alleged national support was "the fact

\* Corneille's translation of "*Ære alieno obrecti et vitii onusti.*"

of terrorism spread from Paris to the provinces and still maintained by the deportation of opponents without trial; and, finally, after seventeen years, the suppression of the mere recital of the records of that day by this prosecution before a police tribunal."

Finally there comes the triumphant prophecy of the great orator. "Well! This anniversary which you did not wish to be remembered, we will reclaim it. We take it for our own. We will celebrate it always, incessantly. Each year it shall be the anniversary of our dead until the day shall come when the country, once more become your master, shall impose upon you a great national expiation in the name of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity."

That day of expiation came only two years later on the 2nd of September 1870. The day of Sedan was soon destined to counterbalance the 2nd of December. Despotism founded by force and fraud, nursed within itself the seed of its own corruption. And now the 2nd of December takes its place among the national festivals, and ranks with the days of 1848 and 1830.

The genius of Englishmen does not need any such vent in similar national festivals. A coronation-day, a Prince of Wales's birthday, or a Jubilee, satisfies the Englishman's soul; and it speaks well for our national history that it does so. It is when we cross to Ireland that we find, again, a national aptitude for these celebrations. The Orangemen have accustomed us to read placidly of the annual commemoration of the Battle of the Boyne. It excites their enthusiasm and seems to satisfy temporarily a semi-religious craving. In the South of Ireland a more sinister commemoration, somewhat analogous to that of Baudin's death, has continued now for over twenty years, and in times of repression assumes a national aspect. The death of Allen and Larkin, the "Manchester Martyrs," serve as another sign-post of the baneful progress of English coercion over Irish sentiment. They commemorate not, as was curtly said in Parliament, "the murder of a policeman," but the desperate attempt to rescue men who were considered patriots. That the death sentence was the necessary consequence of such unlawful violence no one can doubt. Whether it might not have been expediently commuted subsequently, as Mr. Bright nobly urged, is open to question.

But the moral of the commemoration is that law, however justly administered in a particular instance, comes to be looked on as hateful and unjust if it is used by an unrepresentative authority to crush out political movements distasteful to it. Instead of suppressing lawlessness, such action only stimulates it. Let us not be mistaken. The Fenian movement was one of Force, and had to be crushed by Force. Those who play with such deadly weapons must pay the penalty, however patriotic and honest their personal motives may be. But the moral blame lies on the policy which creates and fosters Fenianism and Agrarianism. It is a policy of sheer stupidity which

goes hacking away at the popular commemoration of such events as the death of Allen and Larkin, instead of seeking to eradicate the sentiments which make such a commemoration popular. That is the lesson given by the above Napoleonic prosecution with its moral of Sedan. Would to heaven the memory of Allen and Larkin were blotted out of the Irish calendar as well as that of Orange-day! A Home Rule Executive, indeed, would be far too shrewd to attempt the latter object, though it would naturally affect the former. But though the orange glow may momentarily obliterate the green of the struggling dawn, both will fade before the brightness of the fuller day. Meanwhile, it would be well if Irish Nationalists would adopt some memorial day of less sinister aspect than that of the Manchester Fenians. The "Martyrs of Mitchelstown"—representative as they were of the struggle for agrarian combination and for liberty of political association against an unrepresentative coercive Executive—would be fitter subjects for an annual protest, until their commemoration becomes the day of Mr. Balfour's expiation and the anniversary of Home Rule the true national festival. A Baudin, however humble, never dies in vain.

## THE FLAW IN THE EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY BILL.

THE Employers' Liability Bill, which the Government introduced last year, was withdrawn at the close of the Session after a somewhat bitter altercation between the representatives of the working men in the House of Commons and the Ministers in charge of the measure. The sudden explosion of strong feeling then exhibited startled people who were not versed in the details of the Bill, and led to many inquiries as to the reason why the working classes rejected a measure supposed to be conceived entirely in their interest.

The fact is that the Bill went much beyond its ostensible purpose; and, side by side with the main principle of providing that employers should compensate their injured workmen, there was introduced an entirely distinct principle of the workmen's insuring themselves. It is obvious that these two principles may be, to a great extent, antagonistic and mutually destructive, and it was to the insurance proposals that the opposition was directed. Several matters of detail in the other portions of the Bill were not considered satisfactory, but the opponents were prepared to make almost any sacrifice on these points in order to pass the measure. The insurance proposals stood on an entirely different footing, and all the forces of the great working-class organization, both the trades unions and the friendly societies, were united in an indignant opposition to this portion of the Bill. The workmen felt so strongly that they were willing to sacrifice the whole Bill rather than accept the insurance scheme which, against their wishes, was included in it. The Government stood firm, and, finding the opposition equally immovable, sacrificed the Bill for the time being. They have announced that the measure will be reintroduced during the present Session, and, as it is understood that the Bill of last year will be reproduced in exactly the same form, it is desirable that the objectionable clauses should be briefly considered.

The insurance scheme is contained in the third and fourth clauses of the Bill. The principle of the remainder of the measure was conceded some years ago, and a new Bill is only rendered necessary to-day by the fact that the Employers' Liability Act of 1880 was passed as an experimental measure, and was originally intended to

continue for seven years only. In order that we may understand the bearing of the insurance part of the new Bill, it is necessary to review the history of the general question.

Previous to the year 1880 a most serious injustice to the employés of colliery owners, railway companies, and other hazardous employments had grown up. If any ordinary person were killed or injured by a railway accident, colliery explosion, or any other act of negligence of the responsible servants of an employer of labour, such person could, of course, obtain compensation from the employer of the negligent servant. But any man who happened to be in the employment of the negligent firm was specially debarred from claiming any compensation whatever. This was due to an absurd and untenable fiction of the law courts, that all servants of one employer were equally free agents, engaged in a common employment. If a number of men working together injured one another, they were not to look to a third party to pay the bill. This is a plausible argument which was allowed to prevail in a test case twenty years ago; but it is obvious that so long as the general public can claim compensation from a third party, this is a piece of unsound special pleading disastrous to the working classes. The guard and driver of a wrecked train are practically members of the public, so far as their connection with a negligent or incompetent signalman who wrecked it is concerned. The fact that they are paid by the same employer gives them neither choice in their association with him, nor knowledge of his faults. It is obvious that so far as an ordinary miner or labourer is concerned, the negligence of other servants of his employer is as much the negligence of the employer who appointed him, and that, equitably, there can be no distinction made between an injured servant and an injured stranger.

The Act of 1880 established the principle that if an employé was injured whilst obeying the orders of his employer or any person to whose orders he was bound by his employment to conform, and who was injured by the neglect of any person to whose orders he was bound to conform, he should be able to obtain compensation for his injury. This was a great step, and if it had been allowed free operation would have resulted in most satisfactory relief to the working classes, and would have, above all, imposed much greater care on all employers and their responsible deputies to prevent accidents. But a means was found to set this Act aside to a very great extent, by virtue of a system which had been highly beneficial to the workmen in the past, but which was now turned into a weapon against them.

For many years prior to 1880 the men engaged in some of the most hazardous employments, such as mines and railways, had, with wise forethought and thrift, adopted a means of avoiding the most serious consequences of the accidents to which they were liable. By the aids of special clubs and friendly societies, they made provision



for the consequences of disablement and death incidental to their daily labour, just as they provided by similar means for ordinary sickness and bereavement and the other unavoidable casualties of life. When the Act came into force these makeshift personal agencies were, in principle, supplanted; but the new law being incomplete and uncertain, and the fund for accidental injuries being in many cases practically the same as that for sickness and bereavement by natural causes, which of course were not affected by the Act, it was neither desirable, nor possible, to suspend abruptly this system of insurance. At the same time many employers had benevolently assisted the thrift of their workmen by subsidizing the funds of their societies. This was a partial admission by employers of the justice of the contention that a responsibility rested on them in the matter, and it was to that extent an anticipation of the legal responsibility subsequently enforced by the Employers' Liability Act. When the Act was passed the relation of the two parties to these arrangements was in principle revolutionized. The contribution of the employer to an accident fund provided by the men themselves became no longer a benevolence, but an inadequate instalment of an amount for which the law now declared him liable. Advantage was, however, immediately taken of this existing system to set aside the new law. Employers made a rule that all servants in their employ should become members of the insurance club, and, under pain of dismissal, should agree to relinquish all claims against their employer under the Act, and look to this fund alone for compensation in case of injury. The workmen strongly resisted this idea of being coerced into contracting to set aside a law of the land. They carried the matter into the law courts, but in the absence of anything to the contrary in the words of the Act, the courts refused to break the disabling contract. The question was fought on a case occurring in one of Earl Dudley's collieries, in which the earl had subscribed a sum to the fund equal to the whole amount subscribed by the men, thus providing no less than half of a fund which was available for other casualties than those for which the new law declared him to be liable; there was therefore a considerable show of reason on his side, and he won his case. The courts having, however, established the point that an agreement might be legally made to set aside the Act, advantage was immediately taken of it in other cases, which was obviously unjust. Some employers were of opinion that the mere fact of giving a man employment at all when he was out of work was a sufficient consideration on their side in a contract to set aside the law. Gradually during the seven years which have elapsed since the Act was passed the system of contracting out of it has been grossly abused. A man out of work is not a free agent in making an agreement. He must accept whatever is put before him; and, in the case of thousands of men the benefits conferred by the

Act have been reduced to a minimum, and in some cases have entirely disappeared. This has not been confined to the old benevolent clubs existing before the law was altered; the most rapid development of the evil is due to the fact that insurance societies have been created on all hands for the sole purpose of providing employers with an excuse for, at least, a partial evasion of the Act. It is generally admitted that miners and railway servants have been coerced into resigning the benefits of the Act, and of accepting a mutual insurance scheme which at the best has been very far from a just equivalent. So great has the evil become that some of the working men now demand that the whole of this insurance system, as a substitute for the machinery of the Act, shall be forbidden, that the two objectionable clauses shall be struck out, and that a short one shall be inserted providing that any contract made between a master and workman to set aside the Act shall be void. This may appear to be a sweeping demand, and likely to result in serious injury to existing societies. No one would be averse to some compromise which should safeguard the position of the most deserving amongst them; but it is, obviously, unsound to perpetuate eternally a principle of contracting to set aside the law merely to obviate a present inconvenience. It may, however, be said that, surely it will meet the case if the new law, which is about to be passed, contains strict provisions that the compensation received by an injured man shall be ample and easily obtainable, and if these points are insisted upon, then the manner in which any employer chooses to provide that compensation can be of but minor importance.

Even if it were so, and if a great question of principle were not involved, we should find that the new law is far from securing that the insurance shall be satisfactory. To appreciate this failing involves a closer investigation of the details of the various societies already existing. The class of self-insured workmen consists mainly of miners and railway servants, but there is also a number of societies in connection with less important trades and particular firms. A few of these societies are really excellent, but the great majority are extremely unsatisfactory in their principles or present condition. Taking the best first, we find that amongst the miners, with a total number of 527,000 persons employed in coal-mining in the country, about 236,000 are insured against accidents in their special societies.

There are nine great societies, one in each of the coal-fields of England and Wales. We have detailed information about eight of them. The premium paid and the benefits offered vary slightly in different districts, but they may be roughly averaged as follows: for a payment varying from 2*d.* to 4*d.* per week the miner is assured 8*s.* per week during disablement, and, in case of permanent injury, a lump sum of £5, which is increased to £22 if he has neither wife nor children to become chargeable to the funds. Widows receive 5*s.*

per week during widowhood, and children 2s. to 2s. 6d. per week till they reach an age varying from ten to thirteen. In addition to the miners' contribution, the employers have subsidized the funds to the extent of sums varying from 3·9 per cent. in the Midland Counties to 25·2 per cent. in North Wales. In 1887 the workmen's contributions amounted to £147,550; and the employers' subsidies to £22,218, showing an average for the whole country of 13 per cent. In return for this assistance, 90,562 workmen contracted to forego all rights under the Act of 1880, and to trust to their societies, mainly supported by their own money, to compensate them for any injury they might receive.

The societies of railway employés are twelve in number, and information is procurable about seven of them. These seven include 33,000 members. The first noticeable feature in which the railway societies differ from those of the miners is that each one is established in connection with a particular railway company. A man entering the services of the company, enters the insurance society, the contribution is deducted from his wages, and if he leaves the company he leaves his insurance behind. These railway societies, moreover, as a rule, undertake all the ordinary assurances of a friendly society, in providing for sickness and bereavement in addition to the specially hazardous risks of their employment. Besides these large societies connected with the greatest industries, there are a number of smaller ones connected with other trades.

The first point to be noticed is that these societies have to a great extent grown up under the Act of 1880, and are so many elaborate schemes by the employers to evade that Act.

Whilst most of the supporters of the Act of 1880 are demanding that, at least, a strong check shall be put upon this quite unexpected advantage which has been taken of a doubtful interpretation of the law, it is not too much to say that the new Bill now under discussion not only accepts the evil which has grown up, but legalizes it, encourages it, and puts it in the power of the employers to compel its extension. Thus it is contended that so far as the new Bill claims to establish the direct liability of any employer, it practically drives a coach-and-four through itself, and not only takes away with one hand what it gives with the other, but incidentally, in other ways, puts the working man in a dependent and disadvantageous position. To make this clear, it is necessary to glance at the actual system which the Bill proposes to establish, and which has so very nearly been carried into law.

Clause 3 of the Government measure enables a workman to "surrender the benefits of the Act for a good consideration." The "good consideration" is that the workman shall effect an insurance, and that the employer shall undertake to make "an adequate contribution towards such insurance, such as will ensure the workman

a benefit equivalent to the compensation recoverable under this Act." If any question arise whether the undertaking offered by the employer sufficiently complies with the above requirements, evidence that a similar undertaking has been accepted under similar circumstances "shall be admitted as evidence of the sufficiency of the undertaking." The obvious evil of this standard of past transactions is only mitigated, if it be a mitigation, by an appeal to the Home Secretary or the President of the Board of Trade. We have already seen enough of past transactions to judge that they are not a very satisfactory standard by which to test the sufficiency of future contracts; but a little further investigation will reveal still more serious evils. A recent application of the financial valuation test imposed by law upon all friendly societies, shows that the "undertakings" accepted in the past have been most unsatisfactory and inadequate. The seven great railway societies show an estimated deficiency in their assets against liabilities of no less than £493,297. The four largest of the miners' societies, with a total of 190,000 members, show an accumulated deficiency of £159,400, and an accruing deficiency of £22,500 per annum. The worst is the Northumberland and Durham society, which is the oldest of all, and shows an accumulated deficiency of £73,751, and an annual deficiency of £7808. In the Lancashire and Cheshire the figures are £63,523 and £3752 respectively; and the Monmouth and South Wales Society has £30,000 deficiency in accumulated funds, and is going wrong £8116 per annum.

This headlong progress towards bankruptcy shows that the employers' contributions have not been adequate, and that the "undertaking" that they have offered to their workmen has been a very unsatisfactory one. It is true that all claims have been met, and that in the case of the railway companies the employers practically guarantee that all claims shall be met in future. But it is unjust in the highest degree that a young man who begins to pay his money into the society which is to provide his funeral and support his widow forty or fifty years hence, should see the funds rapidly diminishing in paying the compensation due from his employer to his injured fellow-workman, the solid fund being replaced by an IOU guarantee.

In Germany, where an elaborate State system has been established, the employer contributes 50 per cent. of the funds, whereas here there is no case higher than 24 per cent., and some range as low as 4 per cent.

Clause 4 lays down certain principles for determining the adequacy of the various contributions, for the guidance, doubtless, of the Home Secretary and the Board of Trade; but there is not sufficient data on which these rules can be scientifically put into practice. The enormous accruing deficiencies of some of the

existing societies show how faulty all actuarial estimates have been in the past. They also show that the employers' contribution will have to be largely increased—probably, on an average, doubled or trebled, and when a change so disadvantageous to the great employers of labour has to be made it is not satisfactory to leave the most vital part of the matter for the after decision of even a Secretary of State.

If in clause 3 the workman is asked to give back the rights conferred by clause 1, the Act must leave no loophole for the supposed "good consideration" to be whittled away to nothing by an ill-informed or partial Government official.

It is obvious that to pass the Bill as it is would lead to an enormous increase in the system of mutual assurance societies. We have seen that the Act contains no effective guarantees for their financial security. We will waive for a moment the great objections to insurance as a substitute for liability, and note that there are other most practical evils in the encouragement of these railway and other societies. If a man entering the service of a railway is compelled to enter the sick and accident club of the company, he loses his independence of action with regard to his service. He cannot leave without losing the thrift provision he has made, and even if a surrender value were granted him, it would be of little use, because a man leaving at middle age would then be too old to enter another society. The present degree of independence enjoyed by working men would thus be greatly curtailed. When wages have been earned, they should be paid, and the recipient should be trusted to make his own provision for sickness and death. To make an enforced deduction from a man's wages, for however good an object, should be resented by all who would develop the self-reliant manhood of the country.

We say "for however good an object," but the object is not good. Not only the independence, but the material interests of the men are sacrificed to selfish interest and mistaken philanthropy. There are too many people, amongst whom are some members of the present Government, who with the best intentions towards the working classes are still profoundly ignorant of their real necessities. It is amongst these that the various schemes for a system of national compulsory insurance have found favour. It may be suitable for German working men to have a certain contribution compulsorily deducted from their wages and saved for them by the State, but the working men of England have proved years ago that they do not need this grandmotherly care. The various great independent societies of friendly societies with their total of over two million members have proved that the working men can provide and manage for themselves. The work of thrifty provision for sickness and bereavement is done by the trades unions disbursing thousands of pounds supporting thousands

of men out of work for long periods prove the same thing. Having successfully established a magnificent system of independent self-help they are not likely to consent now to be put in leading strings.

There has been one weak point in this great system in the past. It has been the number of sick clubs, &c., confined to particular places of employment or institutions. Limited membership, faulty management, and mistaken financial principles, have caused rottenness and ruin amongst them. One very general fault, which is almost unavoidable when it is desired to include all the persons in the employment of a particular firm, has been the unsound principle of admitting members of all ages at the same rate of premium, and this is in force in the railway companies' societies to-day. The loss to the working classes, directly and indirectly, by these old unscientific societies has been very serious, and the consequent discouragement to this kind of thrift sadly great. This ulcer on the system of friendly societies has been gradually cut away by the action of the great affiliated independent orders, and now when it is disappearing there is suddenly a proposal to give it a new development under the sanction and encouragement of the legislature, and with the impetus of a desperate self-interest on the part of employers of labour throughout the country.

A working man has more than ample opportunities of joining independent benefit societies, his interest in which he cannot lose, no matter where he goes or what changes of employment he makes. Such societies are thoroughly sound financially, and the management is under the control of the members. It is surely unreasonable to compel him to turn his back on these. A working man does not require the assistance of his employer in supplying himself with a provision for sickness and death. A small subsidy to the funds is no compensation for the loss of independence by the undue power which such a hold gives an employer over his servant, nor for the enormously increased risks and the chance of entire loss if he changes his employment.

If the advocates of compulsory insurance wish to yoke their system on the necks of the working classes, let a complete and fully considered measure be brought in for the purpose and discussed on its merits. It is not only unjust but injurious to attempt to introduce a partial measure by a sidewind.

It is not insurance, however, but employers' liability which we are supposed to be providing at the present time. Insurance in the past as a makeshift expedient, was admirable and praiseworthy; now it stands condemned as unsound and inadequate. The life of each individual is placed in his hands, and he is left to grapple with him over a flood of danger which may at any moment sweep him in death or lifelong injury. The legal recognition of an employer's liability has erected a substantial

bridge. It has been a mistake at the same time that the bridge is open to legalize the old inadequate makeshift and often rotten ferry-boat which had been valuable enough in the old days.

The great question with the working men is, after all, not compensation, but protection. They look at the law from the point of view, not of the pockets, but of the life and limb of the workman. No money will really repay a man for a lifelong injury, or console a widow and orphans for a desolated home. The miner or railway servant has no option but to obey orders. It is impossible for him personally to compel his employers to provide the necessary safeguards. The only means of avoiding such negligence is to enforce a pecuniary fine on the employers if the negligence is proved. The late Mr. Macdonald once startled the House of Commons by declaring his belief that 10,000 miners were injured every year. There existed then no means of ascertaining the truth; but the returns of the lately established insurance societies show that the real number of victims is not 10,000 but ten times 10,000; of the 527,000 persons employed in coal getting, 101,000 are disabled for longer or shorter periods during every twelve months. The miners and their wives and children think that it is possible to gather the fuel of the nation without the slaughter of a pitched battle. One thousand killed and 100,000 wounded would startle the world if it occurred in one place on one day in the presence of the newspaper correspondents; but because it is spread over twelve short months, and over the area of the coal fields of England and Wales, and is only recorded in ruined lives and saddened homes, it passes without comment from the outer world. The workmen demand that it shall at least be as profitable to the colliery owners to save some of these lives as to sacrifice them, and they feel that if the employer's liability to compensate for injuries caused by what is really his own negligence is maintained as clear and direct as the law professes to make it, both injuries and compensation will largely disappear.

The justice of their claim is now acknowledged, and it only needs to be understood that the insurance provisions of the present Bill are merely an insidious attempt to negative its operation for those clauses to be rejected.

## EXCESS OF WIDOWS OVER WIDOWERS.

IN the article which we published in March last on "Work and Women," we stated that "it is not the spinsters who constitute the surplus female population and by whom the labour market is flooded, but the widows;" and, adducing statistics in evidence, we added, "that the widows number as many as 1,410,684, and the widowers 589,644, being an excess of 821,040 women. So great an excess of widows over widowers was scarcely to be expected, and must be regarded as a deplorable thing which seems to suggest at once some default or vice in our social life."

We mentioned as reasons for this excess, "the greater natural longevity of women and the many risks to life to which men of all classes are exposed." We shall now recur to the subject, and shall supply some additional reasons to explain the excess in question. The greater longevity of women than of men becomes a factor in the advanced stages of life. On reference to the Census of England and Wales for 1881 we find that widowers of sixty-five and upwards numbered 180,124, and widows of corresponding age 372,377, whereas at fifty-five the widowers numbered 99,995 and the widows 259,811; and, again, at forty-five the widowers 73,928 and the widows 193,680, so that the excess is still greater where longevity has nothing to do with it. While it is true that men are more exposed to risks than women, the mortality from childbirth must be taken into account; and although small, perhaps, in comparison to the risks which men in general are exposed to, it must count as against the limited number of the married.

We propose to show in this paper what we apprehend is the true and simple explanation—viz., marital disparity. In an article in the *Universal Review* of February last, on "Population in France," Mr. Robert Donald says: "There is frequently a disparity between the ages of the couples which leads to an abundant crop of young widows. For every 100 widowers in France there are 194 widows." How young, too, in our own country some are left widows is shown by the Census of England and Wales of 1881, at which date there were 52,019 widows of the age of twenty-five. Fifty-two thousand widows seem a great number at an age when, according to some



authorities, most women should first marry, especially in these times. As long as women do not submit to the fate which weighs on their natural mates, or companions, but marry men old enough to be their fathers, grandfathers, or great-grandfathers (often widowers), from unwillingness to face the battle of life, or from love of ease and show, so long will there be a gross inequality between the number of widows and widowers.

This custom appears to be growing more and more prevalent every day in this country throughout all classes, and has frequently been subject of comment in the newspapers. That marriage on the part of men is becoming later through the greater struggle of life, the advantages and fascinations of club life and other reasons, is a well-known fact. Now, from the fact of men not only marrying often when far advanced in manhood, but sometimes when nearer the end than the beginning, to which must be added re-marriage, often more than once, and marrying, then, not women of corresponding or approximately corresponding age, but young women, it must follow in the ordinary course of things, without the necessity of any calculation or reference to statistics, that such women must be left widows long before the natural termination of their lives. Some have seen in the fact of woman's greater longevity a reason why she should marry a man somewhat younger than herself, so that she may hope to have a companion in her latter days as well as in her earlier—a season, indeed, in which she often stands sorely in need of a protector. There are, however, counterbalancing reasons, and some of a very valid nature, which are likely to prevent this ever becoming a custom.

However, the difficulty of finding a suitable companion later in life should certainly dictate to women the importance, so far as practicable, of securing a lifelong companion. It is hardly necessary to mention that to do so is one of the essential conditions of true marriage—the ideal marriage which, be it said by the way, is often a very different thing from the base, mercenary counterfeits of to-day, which pass under the euphemism of “holy matrimony.” It is obvious that the idea of endeavouring to procure a companion for life should, for many reasons, be uppermost in the mind of a woman intent on marrying. If widowed, she is at a great disadvantage compared with man in regaining a companion: a man if widowed can easily marry again, and generally does; and this will account at once for the considerably lesser number of widowers than of widows at all ages. A woman, on the contrary, especially if she have children, and she generally has, is seriously handicapped. From natural causes she is almost ineligible so far as single men of her own age, or even older, are concerned.

Does observation, however, show that woman invariably exercises the foresight just indicated? We think not, but should say rather

the contrary. So eager are some, we do not say all, to enter the bonds of wedlock, that if they can reasonably hope that the prospective coveted husband will get through the marriage ceremony and the honeymoon, they seem tolerably contented. Even in this limited forecast they are sometimes led astray by enthusiasm. Only last spring we knew an elderly swain of sixty-five summers, or thereabouts, who, being captivated by a fair young charmer, must needs marry her; it is true, he got through the ceremony, but he was not so successful with the honeymoon, for it came to pass on the fifth day that his soul was required of him. Such little mishaps are by no means unknown to the "faculty," and, if any one chooses to refer to the "Bowman Lecture," as given in the *Lancet* of Nov. 26, 1887, he will see there some curious facts bearing on senile folly.

These amorous veterans, nevertheless, do not always so expeditiously shuffle off this mortal coil and leave this sphere of marriage, for the one where "they never marry, nor are given in marriage," but rather seem to take a new lease of life. What is, however, the lease of life of a man of fifty or sixty in comparison with that of a maid of twenty or twenty-five? It is too often long enough to beget a brood numerous enough to become an eyesore to the Malthusian. And what wonder! Is not the woman told at the altar of the church that the first object of marriage is the procreation of children? Shall we then blame her if she religiously sets herself to work, neglecting health, comfort, happiness, and all the blessings of this life, in the one absorbing aim?

This is not the place to discuss the pernicious and unscriptural fallacy that the procreation of children is the first object of marriage, but who shall estimate the incalculable harm that it has done to the cause of purity and the health of the human race? We have met with many men who have lived lives of self-indulgence and have echoed in substance the words of Sganarelle, an old gentleman of fifty-three, in Molière's *Marriage Forcé*, also about to marry a young woman: "En demeurant comme je suis je laisse périr dans le monde la race des Sganarelle et qu'en me mariant je pourrai me voir revivre en d'autres moi-même." In *Phineas Finn*, one of Mr. Anthony Trollope's works, a middle-aged swain, who prided himself on his broad acres but had nobody to leave them to, was asked very pertinently by the young lady whom he pestered with his unwelcome attentions, why he had not thought of marrying before she was born.

One of the correspondents in the *Daily Telegraph* correspondence of last autumn, showed well how the union of May and December was one of the most fertile sources of the failure of marriage. While May was full of pleasures to come, December was chewing the cud of past ones. The one had lived, the other wanted to live, and here they parted company on the threshold of their married

life. A young woman marrying a man of like age may have to exercise self-denial, the very quintessence of true marriage; but she inspires and encourages him; she is the key to unlock the treasures and stores of his manhood; she is the right person in the right place. On the contrary, for many obvious reasons, in marrying a man at the end of his manhood, she often drags him down.

Gross disparity was forbidden by Jewish lawgivers, and also by the most enlightened of Pagan legislators. Is it wise or prudent to permit the vigour of manhood to be dissipated or wasted, and to allow posterity to owe its origin to the waning strength of old men? It is certainly contrary to the warning voice of the most intelligent and disinterested of the medical profession, who are unquestionably the best counsellors on this subject. The *British Medical Journal* observed, some time back: "There is no contract into which people habitually enter with so little thought for their future health and happiness, and for the moral and physical welfare of their possible offspring." "Every family practitioner knows in how large a proportion of cases the wretchedness of ill-assorted unions depends on physical causes rather than on incompatibility of temper, want of intelligent sympathy, and other decorous veils for unsatisfied nature. The victims themselves are often unconscious of the real cause of their suffering, and invoke the aid of priests and legislators instead of that of the physician, who alone can help them."

We cannot, however, terminate this paper with such a summary treatment of the moral aspect of this question. Marriage, in its essence, is the duty of one sex towards the other, and may be approximately expressed as the complementing and supplementing development and utilization respectively of manhood and womanhood, and we are not aware, apart from this, that it differs from any other union between man and woman so far as morality is concerned. The key is not more necessary to the lock, nor the cord to the bow, than is man and woman to each other in respect to the perfection of human life; they are, indeed, as the poet Longfellow says, "Useless each without the other." This widow-making vice of marital disparity is but one feature in that hymeneal profanation which is the curse and disgrace of our age, as it was that of the decline of Rome. If we were to quote the following words without saying that they are taken from Horace, Book 3, Ode 6, any one not knowing them might think they were taken from some current writings: "The present age, teeming with all manner of vice, has first debauched our marriages, our families, and our houses. From this source are derived those calamities which have overwhelmed our country and our people."

The profanation of the marriage covenant, as much in the Church as in Vanity Fair, makes of the moral teaching of to-day, in the name of Christianity, from pulpit and platform, a complete farce;

an insult to manhood and womanhood, and a libel on the finished work of the Creator.

In our article on "Work and Women," already referred to, it is said: "We find that between the ages of fifteen and forty-five the single women are absolutely in the minority, for the bachelors number 4,101,014 and the spinsters only 4,002,118, an excess of 78,896 men." Looking on our society of to-day the reader will realize the truth conveyed in the words of Mr. Hepworth Dixon, in the *White Conquest*: "Nature puts the sexes on the earth in pairs, and man destroys that balance at the cost of his moral death." A little examination will convince the unprejudiced mind that in compensation for whatever amount of female beauty is sold under the guise of "holy matrimony," or wasted on the artificial, illegitimate exactions of convention, a corresponding amount is bought outside of marriage to satisfy the natural and legitimate claims of manhood. We say nothing here as to the morality or immorality of this practice, but simply state the conclusion arrived at by observation. We see, consequently, that the "social evil" is but the reflection or shadow of an unsocial evil, and we must not, therefore, wonder if all the agencies of the philanthropist and the missionary efforts of the evangelist fail, when we know how impossible it is to remove a shadow while that which causes the shadow remains. As the unsocial evil decreases so will the "social evil" decrease, and as the former increases so will its counterpart increase. They bear the relation to each other of cause and effect. Remove the cause and the effect will disappear.

## OUR 'NEXT NAVAL WAR.

THE great changes which have taken place during the last thirty years in the means provided for conducting marine warfare have naturally tended to produce a considerable variety of opinion among professional authorities with regard to the present position of England as a naval Power. The methods of attack and defence on which reliance is now mainly placed have been modified and developed almost entirely by theory and experiment; but their efficiency in a serious encounter still remains to be proved. Year by year ships, guns, projectiles, and explosives, are produced in what seems to be an endless succession of types; and, with so many changing factors to be taken into account, it is not surprising that even those who may be regarded as the most competent critics upon the subject should be unable to agree. Nor is this general uncertainty confined to the ability of our fighting ships to hold their own in any future contest. If a complete revolution has taken place in the mode of conducting naval hostilities since the British fleet last took part in any important engagement, there has been a change of a not less sweeping character in the conditions under which, so far at least as this country is concerned, a serious and prolonged struggle upon the sea would have to be conducted. The principal modifications in the general system of naval fighting have been introduced since the outbreak of the American Civil War; but it is now almost eighty years since England was under the necessity of really exerting her maritime strength, and it is needless to say that during this period the whole condition of affairs has altered to such an extent that it is now impossible to draw any definite conclusions from the experience of the past with regard to the general results of any future outbreak of hostilities with a Power capable of maintaining a naval contest. Indeed the country has enjoyed what has practically been a state of peace so long, that it may be questioned whether the public are sufficiently alive to the nature of some of the ulterior and indirect consequences which a serious war of this kind would inevitably produce. Since the time of the first Napoleon our fighting has all been conducted in distant parts of the world and, beyond the question of expense, it has never entailed any real inconvenience upon the country generally. It is not surprising, therefore, that public attention should be drawn away from what might seem to be

the minor issues of the question, and that it should be devoted mainly to the problem of rendering our shores safe from attack. Although we have happily had no practical experience of war, we are all fully alive to the terrible nature of the consequences a successful invasion of England would involve; and it is natural that we should be prepared to adopt the utmost precautions against the bare possibility of such a disaster occurring.

Whether the means now provided for the security of the country itself are sufficient or not is a question we do not here propose to discuss. For the moment it may be assumed that they are ample to render us safe against an attack even from any two of the great Powers combined. But, whatever may be the truth in this respect, an examination of our present position and of the conditions under which England would have to take part in a naval war will show that, if the British navy were doubled in strength, it would still be unable to protect us against dangers and difficulties of the most serious character in the event of our having to enter single-handed into a struggle with a powerful enemy. Although it may be impossible to estimate the actual strength of our naval resources, there are certain essential facts connected with our position which afford safe and reliable indications of the secondary effects which would be produced in the course of such a war; and as there is every reason to believe that some of these might be avoided by the adoption of certain changes in the policy hitherto followed by this country, it may not be altogether useless to review the main features of the question as it now stands.

And here it may be remarked that, under existing conditions, a war between England alone and either of the two great Powers of Western Europe, or the United States, would necessarily assume a naval character. The military organizations of the leading Continental nations at the present day are established upon such a vast scale that it would be impossible for England to make an attack on any point by land without the aid of an ally, while in the case of the United States the task would be equally hopeless. It is true the Americans are unprovided with a standing army of any great strength; but the most ardent believer in the military prowess of our country would not maintain that we could cope successfully with the millions of men who would spring to arms upon the threat of an invasion of the States. It is indeed often asserted that a fratricidal war between the two great English speaking nations has become a moral impossibility. Happy would it be for both, and indeed for the whole civilized world, if this assumption were grounded on anything like logical certainty. Unquestionably, it ought to be an impossibility; but when we remember that only thirty years have elapsed since the States were engaged in a struggle still more fratricidal, and since an armed force left our shores for the purpose of attacking them over

what was by no means a momentous difference; or when we bear in mind the boundless prospect of disturbing elements arising from the Irish problem with which England has to deal, we can perceive upon what a shallow basis this pleasing theory is formed.

Those who regard the contingency of a war with the United States as being altogether beyond the range of probability must perforce shut their eyes to the existence of those characteristics in human nature which still give war a front place among the evils resulting from human folly. If these failings manifest themselves somewhat less prominently in the States and in this country than among the inhabitants of France or Germany, the fact does not arise from any radical difference in moral constitution, or from superior sagacity in the one case. It is due rather to the accident of geographical position. The same forces are present in all communities alike—glumbersome and latent perhaps in some instances, but liable at any time to be roused into action, with their usual disastrous results. So far as it is at present possible to judge, there is not the smallest reason for supposing that the Anglo-Saxon race has become emancipated from the passions and prejudices which induce men generally to devote a considerable portion of their skill and energy to the business of destroying each other, or of preparing to do so; and, until it can be shown that they have done this, it will be altogether vain to talk of the impossibility of an outbreak of hostilities. Terrible as such a contingency may seem, it unfortunately still belongs much more to the region of probability than of possibility; and, this being the case, the wisest thing we can do is to examine our position with a view of discovering what practical means there may be of lessening the extent of the catastrophe, if it should at any time come to pass. And it cannot be too clearly understood that the greatest danger which can befall this country is a war with the United States. The reasons for this will be referred to more fully further on; but happily the means of avoiding its worst phases still lie within our grasp, and if the people of England could be induced to view the situation in its true light, uninfluenced by those who, either from motives of self-interest or from mere traditional bias, are certain to use their utmost endeavours to prevent the adoption of the one rational mode of escape, they might not only deliver themselves from what is now a grave peril, but also effect a large reduction in the burden of taxation they have to bear for the purpose of providing a system of naval defence.

In examining our present position the first point to be taken into consideration is what may be termed the highly artificial existence which England is compelled to lead. Since the close of the last Anglo-French war the population of the United Kingdom has about doubled itself; but the means of support produced within our own borders have increased only to a comparatively small extent during the same period. Agricultural operations are now conducted upon

a more efficient system than they were seventy years ago it is true; and doubtless the total produce of the country in the shape of articles of food is greater than it was at the commencement of the century, but the increase is by no means proportionate to the growth of the population. The large trade existing in connection with the import of food supplies has sprung up almost entirely within the last fifty years; and it has now assumed such proportions that its continuance has become indispensable almost to our daily life. The United Kingdom does not produce more than one-third of the corn consumed by its inhabitants, and the other two-thirds have, therefore, to be brought from across the seas. The annual value of our food imports is at the present time considerably over one hundred millions sterling, and it is needless to say that any serious and prolonged interruption of this great stream of supply would reduce the country to a condition of dire necessity. Nor is the steady flow of our food imports the only important consideration connected with our foreign trade. The wealth of England is derived in the main from the export of manufactured articles—the value of this branch of her commerce being more than two hundred millions sterling—and, if all this produce could not be shipped abroad with a fair degree of regularity, the millions of toilers by whose industry it is created would be brought to a state of want and destitution as effectually as by the cessation of the import trade. In short, England could not exist as a nation if her connection with the outside world were seriously interfered with; and in this one fact we have ample evidence of the momentous considerations involved in a war with any Power which could maintain at sea a naval force capable of interrupting her foreign communications.

So far as the interests of commerce are concerned naval warfare is still governed theoretically by the stipulations of the Treaty of Paris of 1856, except in the case of the United States—the American Government having, for certain important reasons, declined to enter into that agreement. Spain was the only European nation of any importance which held aloof; but as Spain makes no pretence of taking any high position as a naval Power, her abstention does not materially affect the question. The essential features of the Treaty of 1856 are that the neutral flag shall cover an enemy's goods, except contraband of war, that privateering is abolished, and that blockades in order to be binding must be effective. With the United States we have the Treaty made after the settlement of the *Alabama* claims in 1871; but this merely defines the duties of neutrals in preventing the fitting out of ships for warlike purposes, and does not bear directly upon the points now under consideration. As regards England and the States, matters remain therefore practically in the position they occupied at the close of the war of 1812–14.



The Treaty of 1856 was subscribed to by England without any previous sanction from Parliament, and when its provisions became known, the Government of the day had to defend their action against a most vigorous attack. It was maintained that the abandonment of the right to capture an enemy's goods on board neutral vessels was a serious disadvantage to a country whose naval strength was her main reliance; and what, it was asked, in the event of a war with a nation like France, could England do beyond stopping her enemy's sea trade? In the House of Lords arguments in this strain were listened to with strong approval, and in the division which took place no less than 102 peers voted against the ratification of the Treaty, the Government being supported by 156.

There is still a considerable number of persons in this country who adhere to the conviction that a grave mistake was made when England formally relinquished the so-called right of capturing an enemy's goods wherever they might be found, just as there are still occasionally to be met some few eccentric individuals who are unconvinced of the soundness of the Copernican theory of the solar system. These, however, are beyond the reach of any argument. It would be useless to point out that, whatever may have been the case at the commencement of the nineteenth century, when France was the only nation which could dream of contesting our maritime supremacy, and when England could therefore adopt with impunity the most high-handed measures for bringing her long struggles with Napoleon to a successful issue, it would clearly be impossible to uphold the power to seize ordinary merchandize on board neutral ships at the present day. If we were engaged in a war with France or Germany, for example, a single exercise of such an imaginary right in the case of goods owned by a French or German subject, and in transit to New York on board an American ship, would lead to a rupture with the United States as surely as the seizure of the ship itself, unless an apology were made. No nation capable of resisting such an indignity would submit to it; and those persons who profess to deplore the principle formally agreed to in 1856 would probably be among the first to call out for vigorous measures if British vessels were at any time stopped upon the high seas and taken into port in order that goods might be removed from them, simply on the plea that such goods belonged to the subjects of a belligerent Power.

But, apart from the impracticability of the former system, there was another equally cogent reason why England should have given her assent to the Treaty of Paris so far as it affected the inviolability of the neutral flag; and as this bears directly on the question whether some further and more radical modifications should not be made in the same direction, it deserves fuller consideration. England is the only nation whose existence may be said to depend on the direct over-sea trade, and whatever advantages she may

possess in her superior power for naval attack, the interests she has at stake are by far the most vital. The complete blockade of all the ports of any Continental nation might cause considerable loss and inconvenience, but it would never lead to any definite result, or bring about the final settlement of a war. The ocean trade of France or Germany, or of any other European country, could easily be carried on through neutral ports by the aid of the modern system of railway transport, while for England there is no alternative, and the successful interruption of her foreign trade would reduce her to a state of impotence as effectively as the presence of an invading army of half a million men. Whatever may be said of the stipulations of the Treaty of Paris as regards the neutral flag, they constitute a clear net advantage to this country, seeing that we had little to gain and everything to lose by the system they abolished.

At the same time it must not be imagined that the conditions of the Treaty would provide us with the means of securing an uninterrupted supply of the necessities of life during a naval war, for they contain an important exception with regard to contraband. All authorities on international law are agreed that contraband of war may be held to include anything necessary for either the defence or the subsistence of belligerents; and in the case of this country, it might certainly be made to include all food supplies. If we were engaged in a maritime contest, our enemies would at once proclaim their intention of treating these as prohibited articles, for in no other way could they strike such a heavy blow at our position. And they would have ample warrant for such a course in the example set by England herself during her war with the first French Republic. In that struggle the British Government issued orders for the seizure of all vessels transporting provisions to French ports, on the ground that there was a possibility of reducing her enemy by famine; and if this could be done with a Continental nation, there would be still more solid justification for the same procedure in the case of a country whose chief means of support must necessarily be borne by sea. In the event of a war, however, it is not likely that our opponents would search for precedents in the matter. The possibility of inflicting serious injury in this manner would be only too apparent, and the opportunity would assuredly not be neglected if they possessed the means of turning it to account.

With respect to the question of blockades, our position is not materially affected, either for offensive or defensive operations, by the stipulation that in order to be binding they must be effective. For the reason already referred to, there is no Continental nation which would be vitally injured by the total suspension of its direct sea trade, while in our own case, the contingency of a blockade hardly requires consideration in connection with the present ques-

tion, since it is evident that, if matters should ever arrive at this desperate pass, our means of resistance by sea would be practically exhausted.

To some extent the abolition of privateering is an advantage for England; but even here the change is more apparent than real. Our own Government have made extensive arrangements for commissioning private vessels for fighting purposes, and doubtless other nations will adopt a similar course when the occasion arises. Indeed, the Germans took decided steps in this direction during the Franco-German war of 1870-1, by authorizing the creation of a volunteer navy for the destruction of French vessels. This auxiliary force was to consist of merchant ships, manned by merchant seamen, their officers being provided with temporary commissions, but wearing naval uniforms. The decree for carrying the scheme into effect specified only French ships of war as the objects of attack; but there is no reasonable doubt that, if the war had continued, and the projected force had been raised, it would have been used indiscriminately against any vessels sailing under the French flag; for although the Germans, at the outbreak of the war, had declared their intention of abstaining from all attacks on merchant ships, they withdrew this declaration after the issue of the decree respecting the proposed volunteer navy. It is tolerably clear, therefore, that while privateering has been theoretically abolished by the Treaty of Paris, the change is really only one of form, and that the old practice of devastating an enemy's commerce by means of merchant ships, temporarily fitted and armed for the purpose, will still be had recourse to under a somewhat more organized method than that of merely granting letters of marque.

In the case of the United States there is not even a formal restriction upon privateering, and as they maintain only a comparatively small regular navy, it is certain that they would avail themselves of this mode of warfare to the utmost possible extent, in the event of an outbreak of hostilities with this country. There would be every inducement for the adoption of such a course, and, at the same time, highly favourable opportunities for carrying it into effect. It is true that the States would necessarily suffer great loss and inconvenience from a war with England, seeing that the bulk of their great export trade in articles of food and raw material is directed towards our shores; but the total suspension of this trade would be felt more seriously on this side of the Atlantic than on their own. It would not seriously affect their power for offensive operations; but for this country the disorganization of commerce that would result from such a struggle, would involve consequences of the utmost gravity. Of the probable nature of these it will be necessary to speak immediately. Here, however, it may be pointed out, that, whatever effects might be produced; there is no other P

which possesses facilities and advantages in any way approaching those at the disposal of the United States for waging a destructive guerilla warfare upon our huge and scattered mercantile navy. Their long coast line, their numerous harbours, their great distance from our naval centres, the ease with which ordinary mail steamers may be turned into formidable cruisers, and last, though not least, the special fitness of the American character and disposition for naval enterprise, would enable them to place our maritime trade in a position of jeopardy more effectively than could be done by any two European Powers combined. In a war with them under the conditions at present existing, we should have to deal with a state of affairs in which the defence of our foreign trade would take precedence of every other consideration; for in this direction we should certainly be attacked with all the energy and resources which the Americans could command.

In such a contest the leading part would not be played by heavy ironclads, but by cruisers and vessels of the mail steamship type. Our powerful men-of-war might perhaps cross the Atlantic, bombard forts, and destroy shipping, as was done by the British fleet in the war of 1812-14. Yet operations of this kind would not greatly contribute to the final settlement of the struggle. The swift vessels which would be employed in capturing and sinking our merchant shipping could be dealt with only by others of a similar class; and the war would quickly resolve itself into a system of plunder and destruction. One result of this would of course be the immediate and total disappearance of the United States mercantile navy from the high seas. But the tonnage of this is at present only about one-eighth part of that registered under the British flag; and although the monetary loss which its enforced idleness would entail would be serious, it would do little more towards bringing the States to terms than would the bombardment of their coast defences. They had an experience of this kind during their Civil War, but it in no way retarded their subjugation of the rebellion, although their mercantile marine was then far more extensive than it is at the present time. Nor would their power for offensive operations be sensibly lessened thereby, seeing that fast merchant ships can be obtained practically *ad libitum* for money, and that the operation of fitting them out for mere purposes of destruction is one which need occupy but a very limited period.

The difficulties that would arise from the exposed and vulnerable condition of our marine trade in the event of a war with the United States would also be experienced to a more limited extent in any European war in which we might find ourselves opposed to either of the great Western Powers. The ability of Germany to despatch vessels for the purpose of destroying our commerce is somewhat modified by the fact that her position renders an effective blockade of her coasts comparatively easy; and even in the case of Italy, hostile

operations of this kind might be confined chiefly to the Mediterranean by our maintaining a strong naval force at either exit. France would of course prove our most formidable opponent, as her powerful fighting ships and long line of open coast would render it difficult to prevent cruisers from gaining the ocean. But at the same time we must not assume that our foreign trade would escape attack from Germany or Italy, or even from Russia, if we happened to find ourselves engaged in hostilities with one of those nations. There is no lack of first-class steamships at the present day, sailing under various foreign flags, nor is there anything to prevent their sale by neutrals for apparently innocent purposes in time of war. They might be acquired in any part of the world, and the small outfit necessary to equip them for hostile purposes could be provided without serious difficulty, whilst the letter of the Declaration of Paris might be complied with by giving temporary commissions to the officers in command as was intended in the German scheme of 1870-1 above referred to. It is only too apparent that nothing is needed but a free expenditure of money, and a moderate display of energy and resource, in order to produce dire effects among the thousands of British ships which are ever scattered over the seas of the world; and as our foreign trade constitutes the only vital point at which we can be attacked, so long as the supremacy of our fighting navy is maintained, it is not to be imagined that the opportunity would be neglected in any future war that may take place. Of all our possible opponents the Americans are unquestionably the most dangerous; but the facilities for successful action are so great, and the prizes to be gained so tempting, that a nation much less favourably situated than the United States, and whose people are much less disposed than the Americans for naval undertakings, might hope to effect injuries of a most serious character upon our ocean-borne trade.

It remains to be seen to what extent the United States Government would endeavour to prevent the sailing of vessels from American ports for hostile purposes in the event of a war between England and any European Power; and it may seem ungracious to express any doubts upon the point at present. Yet it cannot be forgotten that the theory which connects the prolonged resistance of the Southern States in the great Civil War with the aid furnished by British blockade runners has been embodied as an article of faith in American history, nor that public opinion in the States almost unanimously attributes the present unsatisfactory condition of the American shipping trade to the action of the cruisers which sailed from British ports during the war. As a matter of fact the latter is due to very different influences; but these are generally overlooked when the question is referred to in public in America, and England still has to bear a large share of the responsibility. A mutual agreement has since been entered into, and some relations have been

made for the injury and loss occasioned through our neglect; but in spite of this, it is to be feared that there would be an almost irresistible temptation to refrain from exercising the highest possible degree of vigilance in the matter. And, without this, serious difficulties are certain to arise. However friendly may be the general tone of the Americans towards England, there is no denying the fact that their country contains a large number of persons who are our most bitter enemies, and who would eagerly seize upon any opportunity for injuring our interests. A naval war would afford constant facilities for such as these to display their animosity, whilst the ports of the United States would afford every chance for carrying their designs into effect.

## II.

The gravity of the effects that would be produced by an outbreak of hostilities between England and any powerful nation would, of course, depend in the first place on the activity and vigour displayed by our enemies. It has already been pointed out that such a war must necessarily be waged upon the sea—unless it were in the defence of our Indian Empire—and it may therefore be assumed that they would spare no efforts in attacking our widely scattered mercantile navy, seeing that a large proportion of this must at all times be in isolated and exposed positions. As regards the probable consequences of a state of war there exists a considerable amount of misapprehension, even among those whose personal interests are immediately concerned. It is often supposed by those connected with the shipping trade that if attacks from hostile cruisers became so frequent as to affect the safety, and consequently the rate of insurance, of cargoes sailing under the British flag, the difficulty might be avoided by a wholesale and merely formal change of nationality in the official registers with which all vessels have to be provided. But an evasion of this kind would certainly be impracticable, if not altogether, at least to such an extent as to be of any real utility. In the first place, all the leading maritime nations, except France, require merchant ships under their flags to be registered in the names of persons who are their own subjects; and even France requires this to the extent of one-half the value of the vessel. This condition would of itself place very serious difficulties in the way of a general and temporary disposal of our large mercantile navy. But there exists a still more formidable barrier to this; for no enemy would think of recognizing such an evasion as a subterfuge. On this point the rules of our own Admiralty Courts have always been most explicit and distinct. When it has been shown that in a transfer, effected during a state of hostilities, there has been any covenant, or condition, or even

tacit understanding, that the vendor retained a portion of his interest in the vessel, the contract has been regarded as void. And even when the ship has been sold outright to foreigners, but has continued in her former trade, she has been condemned. In short, the practice in our courts has been to require such rules to be absolute and unconditional, with a complete change of employment, and to imagine that our enemies would hesitate to interfere with British vessels simply because they had taken refuge under neutral flags is to assume that they would voluntarily adopt a policy exactly the reverse of that which England has always followed, and deliberately abandon the most formidable weapon which offers itself to their hands.

The immediate results of an attack upon our mercantile marine would, of course, be the imposition of war premiums of insurance, followed by a proportionate rise in freight charges upon goods shipped for transport. The extent of these additions would naturally depend on the nature of the measures adopted by our opponents, and on the degree of safety which our naval forces could secure; but there can be no doubt that if only a few hostile cruisers could be kept at sea, the mere fact of their being at large would produce definite and appreciable effects. And, looking to the closeness of the competition that prevails in the marine carrying trade in time of peace, it may reasonably be inferred that anything like a serious difference between the cost of transport in British, as compared with neutral, vessels would soon tend to leave the former behind in the struggle. The spirit of commercial rivalry which ignores all national and sentimental considerations would quickly affect the power of our ship-owners to hold their own, and would ultimately reduce their vessels to a state of idleness as effectually as the presence of hostile men-of-war off the ports where they might be lying. These effects would, of course, not be produced at once, even if our enemies succeeded in maintaining a fairly powerful fleet of cruisers at sea. At the present time nearly 50 per cent. of the whole foreign-going shipping of the world is sailing under the British flag, and after making allowance for the falling off that would probably take place in our own import and export trade in consequence of a war, it is not likely that the services of all this tonnage could be readily dispensed with. For a time it would share in the rise of freights. But the advantages neutrals would enjoy would inevitably give a great impetus to ship-building for neutral flags, and as the mercantile navies of foreign nations increased in size, our own vessels would lose their employment. And as the total annual earnings of our merchant shipping is estimated at something like £50,000,000, it is clear that the interests which England has at stake in her marine carrying trade constitute in themselves a matter of very great importance.

In 1885, when there seemed to be a pro-

hostilities with Russia, the shipping community began to realize to what an extent their interests must necessarily be exposed in any future war, and a public movement was then commenced in support of a national system of marine insurance against war risks. It is unnecessary to refer to the various practical difficulties which render such a scheme altogether chimerical. Apart from these, it must be remembered that the questions at stake are by no means limited to the possibility of owners of ships and cargoes incurring serious losses through the depredations of hostile cruisers. The whole nation is interested in far wider issues than this; and the dangers to be guarded against would certainly not be met by simply adopting a scheme whereby the community generally would have to make good the detriment experienced by individuals. The country already pays a heavy premium of marine insurance in the shape of several millions sterling per annum expended in providing a naval force for the protection of the mercantile marine; but it is altogether unreasonable to suppose that it can undertake, in addition to this, to guarantee every ship owner and merchant against loss in time of war.

However grave may be the possibility of our losing permanently, or even temporarily, a large proportion of our marine carrying trade, it is to be feared that a state of naval hostilities would produce effects which would outweigh this in importance. In the first place, it is tolerably certain that any nation which could engage in a naval contest with England would lose no time in declaring all provisions to be contraband of war, and thus endeavour to intercept our food supplies, whether in course of transit by British or neutral vessels, and if they could at the same time conduct their operations in such a way as to render the risks of capture at all serious, the immediate result of such a declaration would be a great rise in the cost of the necessaries of life. It is possible that, under such conditions, the expense of living for the poor might be doubled or trebled, seeing that two-thirds of the corn consumed in England have to be brought over long ocean routes to our shores; whilst, to add to the inconvenience that would be experienced in this way, the interference with British vessels engaged in the transport of manufactured exports would lead to a great disorganization in our industrial centres, and would throw large numbers of operatives out of employment. Bearing in mind the serious discontent which resulted from causes of this kind after the close of the last Anglo-French war, when the population of the country was only one-half of what it is at the present day, it is to be feared that such a state of things would give rise to social difficulties of the most possible character. The enhanced cost of living, combined with the loss of employment that would be produced by a determination to maintain our maritime trade, would reduce a large number of the population to want, and it is hardly likely that they would exercise much patience. In times of peace those



who find themselves in this unfavourable position are only too ready to attribute their misfortunes to the errors of the ruling powers, or to some imaginary defect in the social system ; but, in the event of a war, they could not fail to perceive the source of the miseries they would have to bear, and, if the struggle were prolonged, there is every probability that civil dissensions would arise, and that the Government would find itself confronted with difficulties at home not less serious than the task of encountering the forces of our enemies abroad.

In addition to the social troubles which would be experienced, a state of naval hostilities would also throw a heavy strain upon the political bonds connecting England with several of her great colonial possessions. This phase of the question has hitherto received very little attention, either here or in the Colonies ; but on the outbreak of a war it will force itself into notice in a manner that will admit of no evasion. The amount of colonial shipping sailing under the British flag is about 2,000,000 tons, or 50 per cent. in excess of the shipping of any foreign nation ; and upon a declaration of war the whole of this will at once be placed in the same position as vessels registered in British ports, so far as liability to capture or destruction is concerned. Without in any way under-estimating the loyalty and self-sacrifice our colonists may be willing to display, it may be questioned whether it would in all cases stand the test of a naval war with a satisfactory result. The risks involved would effect a serious reduction in the freight-earning power of all this tonnage, and could hardly fail to give rise to questions as to the reality of their interests in our quarrels. Whether willingly or unwillingly, they would quickly experience the practical significance of a state of hostilities ; and it may safely be asserted that there is no trial which would prove more promptly and effectually what is the real strength of the present union between the various portions of the British Empire than a war in which naval operations would constitute the leading part.

From the foregoing considerations it is clear that, apart from the question of the defence of our shores from invasion, certain other vital interests of the British Empire must remain open to serious danger so long as the present conditions of naval warfare continue to exist. Thus far the people of this country seem determined to face the difficulty in the traditional manner, by attempting to provide adequate means of defence ; but the task before them is certainly a herculean one. It would perhaps be too much to say that it is at present an impossible one, seeing that the leading nations of Europe are devoting the main portion of their resources to the formation and equipment of land forces, whilst the United States are satisfied to remain practically unarmed. Yet, even under these favourable conditions, the outlay necessary to defend our foreign trade in time

of war would be enormous. The cost of hiring the few merchant vessels chartered in 1885, when there seemed to be a possibility of an outbreak with a weak naval Power like Russia, amounted to upwards of half a million sterling for a period of six months; but this is only a trifle compared with what would be necessary in the event of a war with any two of the Western Powers of Europe, or with the United States. And, if at any time the latter should decide to provide themselves with a navy equal in strength with our own, the defence of our mercantile marine will at once become an absolute impossibility. No naval force, however large, could adequately protect a foreign trade like ours against such an attack as England herself might deliver, or prevent it from withering away under the influence of the ceaseless risks it would have to encounter and of outside competition combined.

Looking to the unmistakable balance of advantage which England would derive from the exemption of private property from capture at sea, it seems strange that she alone should have objected to the proposal to embody this as one of the principles of the Treaty of Paris in 1856, and that no effort should have since been made to rectify the error then committed. Such an arrangement would lead to one immediate and permanent advantage, and would deliver us from two or three serious possible dangers. It would enable us to concentrate all our naval strength on the defence of our shores and of our import trade in articles of food, thus effecting a considerable saving in the annual outlay upon the navy. At the same time it would permit our shipowners to retain the bulk of the carrying trade now in their hands; it would mitigate the shock which the disorganization of this trade would cause in our manufacturing districts; and it would altogether prevent any strain from being thrown upon the bond of union between England and her colonies by the capture and destruction of colonial vessels and the interruption of colonial trade in the course of a war in which the colonies might not possess even a shadow of direct interest. It would, of course, leave the general question of the interception of our food supplies untouched; but this is a danger from which there can be no escape so long as wars of any kind are possible. Yet the objects above referred to would constitute very great advantages for this country; and there is no doubt whatever that they might be attained if England expressed her willingness to accept the principle which the United States so strongly advocated in 1856.

There is reason to believe that the people of England do not sufficiently realize to what an extent their prosperity and welfare are now dependent on their commercial intercourse with the outer world. Seventy or eighty years of what has practically been an unbroken peace have almost lulled all apprehension of danger in this direction; and it seems that nothing short of the rude awakening a

serious naval war would produce, will suffice to rouse them to a sense of their true position. \* Thus far the problem has been dealt with in one way only. It has been left practically in the hands of naval experts and advisers, who naturally view it from their own standpoint. They ignore the possibility of effecting any change of the kind above indicated; nor is it reasonable to expect them to look with favour upon a proposal which would, if adopted, enable the country to make a large reduction in its naval armaments, and thus narrow the field of their utility. It may seem like the utterance of a mere truism to say that the interests England has in the matter are by no means identical with those of individuals who have found careers in the navy, or of naval architects and shipbuilders. Yet the fact must be borne in mind when we have to estimate the significance of the opposition offered to the proposal that private property shall be exempt from capture at sea; and if such a principle is to be carried into effect, the change will have to be made at the instigation of those who pay taxes rather than of those who live by their disbursement.

It cannot be too clearly understood by the people of this country that the decision of the question rests entirely in their hands. The subject of naval defence bids fair to become a convenient field of party conflict. It affords endless opportunities for attacks and recriminations on the ground of parsimony, danger, and extravagance; but if one half the attention devoted to these charges were given to the subject now under consideration, the change would quickly become an accomplished fact. Our Government have but to make the proposal to the foreign Powers concerned; and there is no reason to doubt its acceptance. In 1856 the United States declined to join in the Treaty of Paris simply because it did not embody the principle referred to; and as they have not shown any disposition to establish a strong naval force since, it is morally certain that they still adhere to the same view. Nor is there any reason to apprehend opposition in other quarters, for the naval supremacy of England at the present time is so marked that there is probably no nation which would not readily acquiesce in any arrangement for limiting the sphere of its influence.

The change is certain to be far more strongly opposed in England than elsewhere. So many interests are concerned in a lavish expenditure upon the navy that the proposal to render unnecessary the main portion of the system of defence now provided for our marine carrying trade will be strenuously opposed, while no efforts will be spared to maintain the existing order of things. If a change should be proposed, all the time-honoured arguments for preserving our freedom of action upon the sea, where England for the last two hundred years has been supreme, will be paraded, surrounded by a halo of sentiment derived from the achievements

and traditions of the past. But unless the arguments and considerations above set forth are fallacious, all these should be set on one side. The question is not one to be decided by any particular classes or sections of the community. It is one rather for the great body of taxpayers to determine. They have to bear the cost of the existing system, and they will have to bear the brunt of disasters which no naval force can ward off, unless some modification is made in the arrangements now in force.

Of late the country has embarked upon a determined attempt to strengthen its position under the present system by making a heavy increase in its naval forces. Such a course may be fully justified as matters stand; yet there is no doubt that all this additional expenditure, and all the increased annual outlay which will be involved in the future maintenance of this extra fighting strength, might have been avoided if our Government had, at any time within the last thirty years, made an effort to bring about an international agreement that private property at sea should be exempt from capture. Happily there are still abundant opportunities for effecting such a change, and we cannot too strongly commend the subject to the notice of practical politicians. In the meantime what is required to be impressed on public opinion is the fact that, however great may be the outlay upon our naval defences, our position will always possess elements of serious weakness so long as ordinary commerce remains liable to attack, and that the only obstacles to its deliverance from the greater portion of the dangers by which it is beset have thus far been created and maintained in what has been fallaciously regarded as our own interests. We have endeavoured to state the issues at stake impartially and without bias, and we feel assured that if they could be brought to the notice of the great body of electors, a wide and highly beneficial reform would speedily be effected.

## THE SHAKESPEARE-BACON CONTROVERSY.

THE purpose of this article is not to enter into an exhaustive statement of the growing controversy as to the real authorship of the plays known as Shakespeare's, but rather to focus the main features of the arguments *pro* and *con*, and to add some considerations which may help the ordinary reader towards forming a fair judgment on the important question which has, especially recently, been exercising the minds of the reading public.

From time to time a spirit of scepticism has shown itself relative to the Shakespearian authorship. Briefly the reasons which have been urged against it may be summarized thus: Shakespeare, it has been strongly maintained, was of mean origin, said to have been the son of a butcher, of limited education, and brought up in an obscure country town. That little is known of his life and personality, both during his career as an actor, or playwright, and after he retired from the stage and settled at his native town of Stratford-upon-Avon, so that his real life is almost mythical, to which must be added his very indefinite place among the eminent men who were his contemporaries in literature, authorship, and poetry. All these considerations, it is argued, stand out in startling contrast to the greatness of his imputed writings, confessedly the marvellous creations of an almost superhuman genius. The profound knowledge displayed in Shakespeare of the philosophy of the human mind, the skilful anatomy of the workings of the human passions, the intimate acquaintance which such a writer must have had with English history, besides the languages and literature of France, Italy, including some familiarity with the tongues and annals of Northern Europe (as evidenced by the plot of *Hamlet* being derived from a Danish source), the inherent necessity for the author of the plays having read all the books of travel which grew out of that age of voyages and discoveries, of having some acquaintance with the technicalities of English law, of botany and of medicine, are of such cumulative force, we are told, as to be overwhelming against the supposition that such a man as William Shakespeare, as we know him, could possibly be the creator of the plays which have been "foisted" upon a credulous world, as his!

Such is the heavy indictment, together with much more, which seems to have little more foundation than mere depreciatory gossip, brought against Shakespeare, that he has been denounced in unsparing terms as an unprincipled literary forger, trading on the brains of others, and gathering around himself a halo of glory to which he had not a particle of right. The question then arises—if he be not the true Shakespeare, *who is?* “Aye, there’s the rub.” A question yet far from being satisfactorily met. We purpose in this article to endeavour to face this formidable interrogative, briefly investigate the different counter theories put forth, and carefully ask how far any of them is sufficiently conclusive to bid our great English bard to step down from the lofty throne he has hitherto occupied.

We will first review the attempts which have been made to fix the authorship of the plays upon others, and then examine the reasons for the faith that is in most Englishmen, and we may add, in the greatest minds of other countries, that the “Immortal Will” remains, despite all adverse criticism, “Immortal” still.

A noteworthy attempt has been made to fix the disputed authorship of the Shakespearian, and likewise of other writings, upon a set of literary eccentricities who existed in Shakespeare’s time under the name of “Rosicrucians,” after one Christian Rosenkreuz, a German noble of the fifteenth century. The fame of this curious literary “sect” has just been revived by Mr. W. I. C. Wigston in *Bacon, Shakespeare, and the Rosicrucians*. He endeavours to show that there existed in Shakespeare’s day a learned college of men who wrote in secret, among whom were Lord Bacon, Sir Philip Sydney, Shakespeare, and Ben Jonson, and that these together concocted the plays. It does not appear what share in the authorship he vouchsafes to the great bard; but it is something to know that he cannot be excluded from the partnership. As it is admitted, however, that the main body of his conclusions cannot be established for want of sufficient proof, the ingenious arguments of the writer may be left to be taken for what they are worth, and thus we need not be disturbed by the resurrection of the “Rosicrucians.”

Another claimant has recently been started by the Rev. Scott Surtees, in his book *Sir Anthony Shelley, the Author of Shakespeare’s Plays*, in which he claims the unique distinction for his hero—a learned gentleman, and a great traveller, born one year later than Shakespeare; he, and his brother, it would seem, occupied their time in the fashionable amusement of play-writing; and, for some reason, also *worked in secret*. This theory, like the case of the Rosicrucians, appears to have little more to rest upon, than mere “suggestion” based upon a few stray facts. There are some resemblances adduced between occasional sentences in one or two of Shelley’s ~~selected~~ plays, and some lines to be found in Shakespeare—in *Hamlet*, II., for instance. One cannot help asking, how came

this learned dramatic family, like the "Secret College of Authors," to allow Shakespeare, silently and unanimously, to carry off their laurels? If Shelley and his fraternal coadjutors scrupled not to admit the authorship of some of their work, why not of those plays which were incomparably superior?

This theory of a secret conclave of dramatic writers likewise took shape, strange to say, in the brain of a highly gifted woman in America—Miss Delia Bacon. She came over to this country, dominated by one purpose, to fathom the mystery of the plays, during the time Nathaniel Hawthorne was United States Consul in Liverpool; and had interviews with him, with Carlyle, and other prominent literary men, to whom she propounded her theory, which ascribed the authorship mainly to Bacon, associated with others. Delia Bacon was possessed with the one all absorbing idea that in Shakespeare's tomb there was buried his will, in which would be found recorded full particulars of this conclave of Elizabethan philosophers, and "presto," the mystery would be solved, and the special claims of Bacon triumphantly established. She haunted Stratford Church by night and by day, like "the ghost in *Hamlet*," to the sore disquiet, no doubt, of the worthy parson of the parish, in the vain hope that she might be permitted to rifle the tomb; probably the great poet's malediction upon any one who might pry into his last resting-place only the more whetted her feminine appetite for finding out the supposed secret buried with him. Miss Bacon showed Hawthorne a book she had written in explanation of her theory. He eulogizes her in *Our Old Home* as a highly-gifted woman, but regards the book, which fell still-born from the Press, as founded on "a prodigious error," though containing much that was suggestive. The poor woman became a monomaniac, and eventually died in a lunatic asylum, a martyr to the "Baconian" theory.

The following of Miss Delia Bacon became in her own country, after her death, more numerous than might have been expected. It has been stated, we believe, on the authority of Professor Masson, that the speculation there took more definitely that one form which ultimately resolved itself into what has been termed the "Shakespeare-Bacon craze," more than 250 books, pamphlets, essays, and articles having been published in America, dealing with the subject *pro* and *con*, finally culminating in the noted "cryptogram" of Mr. Ignatius Donnelly, published last year, and which was previously heralded by him in two articles contributed to the *North American Review* for June and July, 1887.

Mr. Donnelly's theory is in substance this: That the plays were in reality written by Lord Bacon, but as several allusions were embodied in them to the leading personages about the Court, and connected with public life, overt allusions, in some cases so uncom-

plimentary that keen censors might construe them into something like treason against the ruling powers; Bacon concealed them in the shape of *dismembered words* scattered through the pages, and employed cypher writing so that they might at some future time be unravelled and their meaning laid bare. We pause here to ask what object could Bacon, or any other writer, have had in interpolating disguised sentiments, entirely unnecessary to the body of the dramatic story, and which were only to be tracked out long after the individuals concerned had passed away? Mr. Donnelly tells us that in the play of *Richard II.* (the play which we have seen is attributed by Mr. Surtees to Sir Anthony Shelley) there were expressions which were regarded by the Court as suggesting the deposition of Queen Elizabeth, upon what authority we know not, excepting upon that of Mr. Donnelly in his "cryptogram." He picks out sundry words from different lines, after the manner of the children's game of "buried words," and concocts the following precious sentence: "My hopes of rising to high office in the commonwealth were blasted; am not an impudent man that will face out a disgrace with an impudent cheek, sauciness, and boldness." Now in this disinterred paragraph there are *thirty* words selected from several pages, containing an aggregate of 6200 words, which are, after all, if suggestive of anything, is simply that of disappointment, surely not of disloyal thoughts. One more illustration. Mr. Donnelly unearths from *Henry IV.* several significant phrases of treasonable import, and names of prominent persons; among these *dismembered* names he discovers Shakespeare, Marlowe, Cecil, Earl of Shrewsbury, Sir Thomas Lucy, Master Francis (Bacon), my Uncle Burleigh, and others. From these and a host of other excerpts he deduces great historical truths, the inner life of kings and queens, struggles of factions, colonization, and other events of the time—all these we are told develop themselves out of this wondrous cypher narrative, with, moreover, a deftly woven web of treason and seditious suggestions. Nor is the quarry from which these buried treasures are evolved limited to the Shakesperian writings, they are equally productive of proofs that Bacon was the author of plays known under other names, and even of other well-known writings besides. Such prodigious exploiting is enough to take one's breath away, and we have in Mr. Donnelly "a Daniel come to judgment," such as Shakespeare himself never dreamed of!

Mr. Donnelly's theory of cypher, we may remind our readers, is worked out by an extraordinary use of figures, which are appalling in their magnitude. We content ourselves by simply referring to a little *brochure*, published by Dr. Nicholson, dealing with this arithmetical puzzle. He, with others, who have carefully tested this ~~chain~~ of figures, have pronounced the clue to the labyrinth as simply ~~unavailable~~, and even leading to conclusions the opposite of Mr.



Donnelly's, and, we may add, that the varieties and uncertainties which gather round the question of the "text" of Shakespeare's plays, must place any such conundrums of figures outside the pale of rational proof.

Before dismissing Mr. Donnelly and his "cryptogram," we would advert to one of his arguments, which has a more literary bearing upon the controversy than the "cypher" discoveries, and that is, the parallelisms which he adduces from Bacon, culled mainly from the *Promus*, and some quotations from the plays of Shakespeare. We cite some of them, interjecting a comment or two by the way.

*Bacon* : "A pillar of iron erected for a prop."

*Shakespeare* : "A prop to lean upon. Pillars of the law!"

The latter quotation form two neat thoughts, distinct from Bacon's line.

*Bacon* : "The finger of God."

*Shakespeare* : "The fingers of the powers above."

Bacon's is simply a Biblical quotation, while the latter line is a fine poetic figure.

*Bacon* : "The soul having shaken off her flesh."

*Shakespeare* : "When we have shuffled off this mortal coil."

If the latter wants elegance, it certainly gains in expressiveness.

*Bacon* : "As a tale told, which sometimes men attend  
And sometimes not, our life steals to an end."

*Shakespeare* : "Life is as tedious as a twice told tale,  
Vexing the dull ear of a drowsy man."

Bacon's idea is the imperceptible stealing away of life. Shakespeare's fine poetic couplet, the weariness of life.

*Bacon* : "The great navies look like walking woods."

*Shakespeare* : "Anon, methought  
The woods began to move."

We venture to think the former is a clumsy conceit, while Shakespeare's thought is finely suggestive in its impressiveness.

*Bacon* : "He is often tossed and shaken."

*Shakespeare* : "After late tossing on the breaking seas."

We may regard the first quotation as simply prosaic after Shakespeare's rhythmic line.

*Bacon* : "The noblest piece of justice."

*Shakespeare* : "What a piece of work is man,  
How noble in reason!"

Can we compare the prosaic line of Bacon with Shakespeare's apostrophe?

Several of the above quotations from Shakespeare are as familiar to us "as household words." Are any of Bacon's? We may extend the question, and ask how many of his sentences have passed into the current coin of quotation, as compared with the store of brief and pregnant lines bequeathed to us from Shakespeare?

We proceed, however, to examine the claims for the Baconian authorship upon such evidence as his own acknowledged writings and his life and mental characteristics afford us. Adverting, in passing, to the "Committee" or "College of Philosophers" theory, we may remark that any one of the best plays—*Hamlet*, for instance—would have lifted the reputation of the author above all other contemporary dramatists, have made a Shakespeare to whom the three centuries since his day have produced no rival—yet, on the "learned college" idea, we have half-a-dozen or more of Shakespeares, producing *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *Macbeth*, and other equal works of genius, sprung upon us, of whom no one knows; all content to remain "unknown, unhonoured and unsung," or entirely oblivious of their collective greatness. Let those who can, account for such an anomaly in literary history.

The strongest case that can be made out in favour of the anti-Shakespearian authorship, it is freely admitted, rests in favour of Bacon. His was the greatest known mind, next to Shakespeare, of the age. The argument employed on his behalf is summarized thus:—Shakespeare *could not* have written the plays; Bacon was the *only known* man who could—*ergo*, Bacon was the author. This rough and ready way of arriving at a literary judgment can only be described as reasoning in a vicious circle, and utterly inconclusive to establish the claim made on his behalf.

Upon what does Bacon's greatest reputation rest? He was a busy and voluminous writer, but that fact does not, to do him justice, disqualify him on the score of want of time, as is weakly argued by some. It is the busiest men who generally find the most time for work. We must pursue our inquiries a little closer. Bacon's main eminence as a scholar and writer rests upon his being the "Father of the inductive theory of philosophy," upon his "pursuit of all knowledge," and on his laboured efforts to make the attainment of that knowledge possible to the world. Yet here his title to fame is now considered to be greatly narrowed. Dean Church's judgment is that his propounded theories were *destructive* of past errors rather than *constructive*. Scholars have pronounced them as incapable of practical application, and declared that no subsequent scientific discovery can be traced to them—in fact, unworkable theories and of the "earth, earthy." Not that they were irreligious in their tendency, because Bacon was professedly under the influence of religious principles, but rather that his philosophy was "earthly" in its groundwork and ~~range~~ *range*. Through all his writings he never rose to the lofty moral and religious heights which we meet with in the plays of Shakes-

peare. His *Advancement of Learning*, viewed in relation to the past, may properly be regarded as giving him a claim to distinction, but its style hardly commends itself to the reading public of our day, and his chief popularity with present day readers rests upon his *Essays*. These present to us the most attractive style of his English compositions. Will any impartial critic, however, think of placing the *Essays*, either as regards their style or their philosophy, alongside the English and the philosophy which so differentiate Shakespeare from every other writer? The *Essays* are quite on another plane of thought; they move in another sphere; they abound in worldly wisdom; they chiefly dilate upon that "conduct" which Matthew Arnold has told us is "three-fourths of life," but have little to say of that other profounder part of life the plummet of Shakespeare's master mind sounded so deeply, and into which there is no evidence from any part of Bacon's writings he ever went below the surface. The rare analysis of the workings of the human soul, with its complex motives, the unravelling of all the passions belonging to human nature, the tender heart touches and pathos incident to human suffering, so far as we can judge from his writings, had no part in Bacon. Search Bacon through, do we find any approximation to Cordelia's tender grace and loveliness of heart unappreciated by her father, King Lear, because delicately concealed, as the tender beauty of the newly-dawning moon is erewhile hidden behind a cloud? The soul of Bacon was surely not "touched to such fine issues." Trace through Bacon for such psychological creations as *Hamlet* and *Macbeth*, and they are not found. Approach the comparison by another avenue—the comic side, as pictured in Falstaff—can we discover that Bacon was gifted with the rare faculty of humour necessary to delineate such an inimitable character as this? We may fittingly close this paragraph by quoting Carlyle's verdict:—"It is truly a lordly spectacle how the great soul of Shakespeare takes in all kinds of men and objects—a Falstaff, an Othello, a Juliet, a Coriolanus, sets them forth to us in their sound completeness. 'Novum Organum,' and all the intellect you will find in Bacon is of a quite secondary order—earthy, material, poor—in comparison with this!"

The question of style, as between Shakespeare and Bacon, can hardly be left out of view, especially with reference to their use of the mother tongue. Dean Church writes: "As an *English writer* Bacon did not expect to be remembered, and he hardly cared to be. He wrote much in Latin, and his first care was to have his books put into a Latin dress; even the *Essays* were thus translated; for Bacon exclaimed, 'these modern languages will at one time or another play the bankrupt with books.' He had his greatest contempt for the mother tongue, the English of his day, while Shakespeare cries, with reference to his own tongue:—

'Not marble, nor the gilded monuments  
Of princes, shall outlive this powerful rhyme.'

A passionate love for Latin as a literary vehicle, such as Bacon's was, must of necessity have a cramping influence upon the free handling of the native language; while, on the other hand, Shakespeare's style, unfettered by any such bonds, is, above all, distinguished for its surpassing wealth of rich, racy, nervous, forcible, yet simple mother tongue—that tongue which Bacon declared would "play the bankrupt with books." Compare sentences from the *Essays*, which perhaps furnish the purest specimens of his English, with sentences from the plays of Shakespeare, and you will be struck with the mellifluous and simple easy flow of the latter, as contrasted with citations from the *Essays* of Bacon. Take one illustration alone from the well-known Essay "Of Discourse"—"It is well to give the occasion, moderate, and pass on" with Shakespeare's

"Give every man thine ear,  
And few thy tongue."

How forcibly simple the Saxon English of the one besides the, it may be, more scholastic English of the other! The Authorized Version of the Bible and Shakespeare have, not unfrequently, been placed together, side by side, as the most splendid examples of what the "English" of the time of Elizabeth and James was capable of. It is curious, in the face of this wide cleavage between two such writers, to find Bacon put forward as the writer of plays wherein the language is from the "pure well of English undefiled," and of which the same cannot be said of Bacon's writings in the same degree, and is—apart from the still greater question of his *power* to create the brilliant roll of characters which lift the plays of Shakespeare above all his contemporaries—to credit Bacon with a capacity for transformation in literary skill, or better, perhaps, innate literary force, which becomes an enigma not easy to comprehend. A man who had, as Lowell observes, "no faith in his mother tongue," would, with his Latin "on the brain," have given us, we think, quite another English to that of Shakespeare.

Lord Bacon, by his advocates, is put before us in a *dual capacity*; surely "there are two Richmonds in the field!" We are called upon to believe in *two Lord Bacons*—the real Bacon, at we *know him*, and another *imaginary, anonymous* Bacon, without any vestige of similarity, moving in different mental and moral orbits, and stretched as far away from each other as can well be imagined.

It may be an apt inquiry: Why should Bacon be content to remain the anonymous author of the plays? So far as we can understand the story of his life, he was not remarkable for modesty, diffidence, and suppression of the "ego." He was not reticent, he seemed to

"wear his heart upon his coat sleeve;" his hopes, pursuits, and ambitions he kept not to himself. And yet, in this, his imputed greatest mine of thought, we are to believe he worked in profoundest secrecy! It would be a poor compliment to Bacon to suppose him unconscious of the superiority of his work in the plays to his published writings, or, if conscious, to cover himself with a shroud of secrecy, simply because of some unpalatable innuendoes which could easily have been eliminated. We close the consideration of the Baconic theory with the opinion of the most exhaustive of Bacon's biographers, Spedding:—"I declare myself not only unconvinced, but undisturbed. I believe that the author of the plays was a man called William Shakespeare. If there is any reason for supposing another author, I am, I think, in a condition to say that, whoever it was, it was not Francis Bacon. The difficulties that such a supposition would involve would be almost innumerable, and altogether insurmountable."

We now turn away from the "pretenders" to the throne of William Shakespeare, and proceed to consider what grounds there are for still holding him to be the "rightful monarch."

Great stress is laid by anti-Shakespearians upon the disadvantages attaching to his parentage and education. He has been sneeringly spoken of as the "son of a butcher," unmindful of the fact that his father combined, at different periods of his life, the occupations of a yeoman farmer, woolstapler, glover, and it may be "butcher"—the last-named occupation would hardly suggest quite the same thing in those times as it does now—but it may be fairly maintained that a man in middle-class life, at that period, following the pursuits just named, would, in a country town, be considered as a reputable personage, and fit to occupy, as we are told he did, the position of an alderman of his town; beyond this, his family lineage was of such distinction as to lead him to lay claim to a coat of arms, possibly from his wife's side, who was of an old Warwickshire family, the "Ardens," and of Norman descent. Their celebrated son, is said, seemingly without a tittle of evidence, to have had little or no education. It is enough to raise a contemptuous smile to find such objections gravely urged, remembering the long roll of English worthies, in every department of genius, who have had the lowliest origin and the scantiest scholarship: but the probabilities as to his education all point in an opposite direction. There was at Stratford-upon-Avon a grammar school, which had been restored in the year 1553 by Edward VI., in whose reign some of the best public schools in the land were founded. It can hardly be the son of such a man as the poet's father, although he may become somewhat reduced in circumstances, would not grammar school of his town. These schools were middle classes, and even for those in somewhat lower for the artisan and peasant there were few educational o-

With regard to the course of instruction in these schools, Professor Baynes has stated that it included the works of Ovid, Virgil, Terence, Horace, and Seneca. Latin was its basis, English grammar not then being formularized, and that the writer of the plays passed through such a course is shown by passages in the *Merry Wives of Windsor*, *Love's Labour Lost*, *Henry IV.*, and others. The Professor adduces illustrations as to the peculiar use made of certain words which were in these school books. That the writer of the plays could read and study in Latin the Professor conclusively shows; and further, that this writer was Shakespeare was highly probable by the fact that some of them were published during his lifetime in his own name, and likewise that competent critics of his day gave him the credit of authorship—evidence for all which he adduces in his articles on the subject in *Fraser's Magazine*, published in the years 1879 and 1880. In fact the position may fairly be taken that Shakespeare would be within reach of a better Latin education than John Keats three centuries later, who simply learned Latin, but no Greek, at an ordinary metropolitan school. Keats, we may remark in passing, though minus education in Greek, yet through the genius within him, caused his poetry to be saturated with the spirit of Greek mythology; and shall we deny to Shakespeare, a similar transmuting power of genius, even on the assumption of a limited Latin scholarship? Our Bard, it is true, had no university education—perhaps if he had been favoured with this, to him, questionable advantage, he would never have written the plays—the severer culture and more trained methods of university scholarship might have been fatal to that freedom, in which by their absence he was at liberty to roam. Macaulay, in one of his essays, remarks that Shakespeare, by this very deficiency, could never have put forth the refined art which characterize some of the Greek plays: so that a comparatively limited classical culture, in the highest sense, tells in his favour as the real writer rather than otherwise.

With reference to the debateable question, as to the career of Shakespeare after leaving school, we quote the opinion of Dr. Elze, in his scholarly literary biography of the poet published recently in Germany. The biographer dismisses the slur cast upon him by some of his detractors that he gained a living by "holding horses," and accepts as most probable Lord Campbell's view, that he became an attorney's clerk at Stratford, attributing the poet's mastery of legal technicology to the experience thus gained. The association with Sir Thomas Lucy, of which much has been made to the detriment of the embryo poet, may be passed by as having no bearing upon his then undeveloped capacities. Dr. Elze presents Shakespeare in every direction to be proved a man of the highest culture, gifted with an exceptional thirst for know-

ledge, and with an extraordinary faculty of observation—a man who, with the keenest penetration and insight, surveyed the whole realm of mental and material life, forcibly adding that it is only as a result of the *most recent investigations by professional men* that Shakespeare's full work in this respect has been properly estimated. Let us ask whose verdicts are most worthy of our acceptance, those of German thinkers like Goethë and Elze, or that of Ignatius Donnelly?

With regard to the sources from whence Shakespeare drew his materials, it is generally admitted, that in common with his contemporaries in the dramatic art, he used up old plays. Emerson says that "he esteemed the mass of old plays as waste stock, in which any experiment could be fairly tried; in fact, all the writers of his day, and before then, were huge borrowers." So was Chaucer. French, Latin, and Italian were all made tributary to the genius of the "Father of English poetry." "No doubt Shakespeare did owe debts in this matter," as Emerson goes on to say, "in all directions, and the extent of such indebtedness may be inferred from Malone's laborious calculations, that in regard to the first, second, and third parts of Henry VI., in which out of 6043 lines, 1771 were written by some author preceding Shakespeare, 2373 by him on the foundations laid by his predecessors, and 1899 were entirely his own." As Malone, however, has been charged by competent critics with writing a deal of folly with reference to the great poet, this deliverance must be taken *cum grano salis*, but there is no antecedent improbability in the assumption that the plays, embracing as they do such a wide grasp of acquaintance with many subjects, would be tributary to the assistance of those whose special knowledge lay outside of Shakespeare's range. It is not necessary to suppose him to have been an "Encyclopædist" in knowledge of men and things, and it may well have happened that floating traditions of such extraneous help eventually stiffened into the idea of a joint or even of another authorship. Shakespeare wrote not as a literary man, but primarily for the practical work of the stage, and *prima facie* was hardly likely to be above using such help as he needed for his immediate purposes.

An objection may be urged, not without some force, that the plots and characters are so interwoven, it is difficult to conceive of the one pre-existing apart from the creations which gave them life. How could the play of *Hamlet*, for instance, it may be asked, have been written at all, in a chrysalis state, without the psychological study inherently connected with it? Yet this would be fatal to *any* theory of authorship imputed to the time of Shakesp are. Apply with equal force to the originality of other distinguished writers. The germs of Goethe's *Faust* existed before him in other shapes. His great genius made the creation specially his own. So Shakespeare may reasonably be credited with the power to take the dry bones of lifeless characters, clothe them with flesh and blood, breathe into them

the inspiration of his matchless genius, and present us a "kosmos" of life unrivalled in all poetry. Let us put a crucial question. Did these creations, these supposed plays of Shakespeare, exist, as we have them, antecedent to his time, or did they not? If they did so exist, where is the record, the evidence, of their being thus extant? Nearly, if not all, that is valuable in the literature of the Middle Ages, whether at home or on the Continent, has been pretty well preserved to us, and yet these marvellous productions cannot be discovered. If they did not exist in their entirety before Shakespeare's day, we cannot lay our hands upon any one name to whom the evidences of authorship so strongly converge as to William Shakespeare.

It has been averred that the plays, as literary productions, were not esteemed when they were produced on the stage—that he did not stand out in his own day as the mighty poet he has since been regarded. Shakespeare, we are told, was only known as an actor, among actors. Be it so; sufficient reasons may be adduced for this. Who were the audiences, let us ask, to whom the players acted, even in the better days of the drama—in the Elizabethan age—before its foulness and decadence set in at the Restoration? Hardly, one would venture to think, those who, with some exceptions, could realize the profound depths of thought, the subtle mental and moral problems enshrined therein. The acted drama, except in the hands of those great masters of the histrionic art who in later times have made these plays their special study, is a very different thing to the same plays passing through the mental analysis of literary study. The ear and the eye convey very different reports to the receptive faculties of the human mind. Charles Lamb shows very forcibly that the profound conceptions embedded in Shakespeare elude the mental grasp in the mere acting. Emerson remarks that the greatness of the plays was not understood in Shakespeare's time, it took a century to make it suspected, and not until two centuries after his death did any criticism which he thinks adequate begin to appear. It was not, he adds, until the nineteenth century that the tragedy of *Hamlet* could find such wondering readers as now. Nor is such a slow development of intelligent appreciation a rare thing. Wordsworth is, without doubt, more appreciatively written about and better understood than in his own lifetime. Poor Keats, after being howled down by the critics of his day, has been rehabilitated in the minds of cultured readers of the present day.

Whatever might be the measure of critical judgment on the merits of Shakespeare's writings in his own day—and on this point the uncultured popular opinion of the time may be dismissed as having no practical value—it cannot be successfully maintained that he has lost honour on the part of contemporaries. The encomium of Ben Jonson," as that of one of the brightest scholars of that age, cannot but be held as going far to establish the fact that Shake-



speare was understood and recognized as a dramatist and poet, the fame of whose commanding powers "the world would not willingly let die." "I loved the man," says Jonson, "and do honour to his memory as much as any." He describes him as "honest, brave, open, free, gentle and witty," calls him the "star of poets," "the sweet swan of Avon," and adds, "he was not for an age, but for all time." Some counter judgment of equal value must be adduced before such a testimony as this can be set aside as worthless.

"For all time;" there is a rare prescient sagacity in these words of Jonson, for no other poet has had the growing immortality that has attended the productions of the "Bard of Avon." We have seen that few of Bacon's works, except the *Essays*, are in touch with modern thought; "gentle Edmund Spenser" hardly meets present day tastes, the archaic forms of language and the long gallery of allegorical characters in the great *Faery Queen*, somewhat pall on modern ears; glorious John Milton's stately and classic rhyme of his *Opus Major* seems to wane in public favour as time goes on. Granted that this is to be lamented, for they are writers of whom a country should be proud; but we do but record the fact, as a contrast to the judgment of posterity concerning the great poet, whose claims form the subject of this article. He is "for all time." Take another indication—the cartoons of *Punch*—a pictorial embodiment of the history of the Victorian era—in which Tenniel draws some of his happiest inspirations from Homer and from Shakespeare; how many of such are traceable to the fountain of Lord Bacon's wisdom? The "Swan of Avon" has proved to be, like Homer, it may be said with unimpeachable truthfulness, "for all time."

The way in which Shakespeare's character has been traduced, as a "knave, cheat, forger, vagabond and liar," may be fitly passed by in silence, as resting on no solid foundation in ascertained facts. There is, however, one aspect of his reputation which should, from a critic's standpoint, receive attention—the assertions so freely made as to the coarseness of his grain, developed in his after life; the vulgarity of his manners, as shown in the rude jokes and quips bandied with the country folk of Stratford-upon-Avon on his retirement thither. How far all this may be true we have no reliable means of testing. The fact of his almost unknown personality in itself would give rise to a vast amount of conjecture and gossip. When little is known respecting any man of eminence, who has been before the world as a public character, a crop of stories without satisfactory data is sure to spring up, like weeds in an uncultivated piece of ground, and of equal worthlessness. The question, however, of conversational powers and social habits, in relation to the possession of pre-eminently superior mental endowments, involves a rather curious study. There are many such men, who, either willingly or perforce, display talking powers of a very

inferior strain. With regard to Shakespeare's habits, especially of converse, in his later life, we see no reason to be staggered at them, even if what is alleged should have been as is asserted. He was not a purely literary man, so far as we know him, in the sense which we understand by the term now, nor perhaps in the more limited sense in which it could be applied in those days. The throwing off from the fountain of his mind, as by inspiration, the marvellous creations of a quite exceptional genius is quite compatible with a low scale of manners and speech; though the words of Ben Jonson respecting him do not support the idea of its applicability to him. Withdrawn entirely from the better atmosphere of his London surroundings, and thrown among the ignorant and boorish population existing then in a small country town, with probably little or no society of any refinement—for we know that rough and rude ignorance was characteristic of even many of the upper classes in those, and even of later, times dwelling in the country—it is quite conceivable that he might suffer a rapid deterioration in social habits. We have known of men, brought up and educated to a superior station in society, when cast entirely among colonists, rude and uncultivated, sadly give way to a marked decadence in manner and speech. Refinement and culture are delicate plants, which droop and fade amidst adverse surroundings. Further, it is known that the capacity for intelligent conversation does not always co-exist with the ability to pen pure and noble thoughts. It is an enigma, but withal a fact, that there are those who can transcribe on paper wonderful conceptions, with great force and eloquence of diction, yet are dumb when they would seek to give utterance in words to the thoughts latent in the brain. Poor Oliver Goldsmith was thus "cribbed, cabined and confined" when he opened his mouth, and so was termed an "inspired idiot," who "wrote like an angel and talked like poor Poll." Surely what was said of Goldsmith *might be* equally predicable of Shakespeare, without destroying the probability of his authorship. We may move a step farther, and say that the writer of the plays, *whoever he might be*, stands out, mentally and psychologically, as a PHENOMENON, and must not, therefore, be judged by the same measure and the same sociological rules we apply to ordinary or even to other gifted men.

But why contend for Shakespeare as the real author of the works known by his name, may be the cry of the utilitarian: "We have the immortal wealth to enrich our lives, what boots it who the writer may have been!" It may be fairly and pertinently answered that on the potent ground of sentiment alone we cling to the cherished tradition of the real personality of Shakespeare; great men and their works are inseparably woven together in our deep and sacred feelings; it is much to know who the men are to whom we are laid under lasting obligations for the highest pleasures of our

lives, and which lift us up serenely above the materialism which so largely oppresses us. \* Chaucer, Shakespeare, Spenser, Bacon, Milton, Pope, Addison, Cowper, and a long roll of illustrious worthies in literature, are time-honoured names, which we embalm in our affections, and we cannot afford that one of them should be struck out of the firmament of letters, that any one of them should prove to be to us as a mere myth. Again, we resent the possibility that historic records, concerning those to whom we owe so much, should be proved worthless, and perish at the touch of modern hypercriticism, dissolving them all into thin air, and reducing them "to the baseless fabric of a vision, leaving not a wrack behind," and so we hold tenaciously, until far better and cogent reasons have been produced to the contrary, that William Shakespeare was indeed the man whom generations will continue to honour to all time as England's "Immortal Bard."

RANDOLPH LEE.

## AUSTRALASIAN FEDERATION.

THE third session of the Federal Council of Australasia, which was held in the last days of January and the beginning of February, at Hobart, the beautiful capital of the island-colony of Tasmania, marks an era in the history of federation among the great group of colonies in the South Pacific. If the session of 1889 had proved abortive, as under certain circumstances it assuredly would have proved, the scheme initiated in 1883 must almost inevitably have fallen to the ground. Before any further advance could have been made, a new departure must have been taken and a new system devised ; and to this task the colonies, dejected by failure, might not unnaturally have been slow to apply themselves. The union of Australasia would have been thrown back indefinitely.

Happily for the political destinies of Australasia and, we may well believe, for the empire at large, the fates that control those destinies were more propitious ; and the crisis in the life of the nascent federal organism took the right turn, so that the outlook is now full of promise of rapid growth and increasing vitality.

Before the vast territories of the great island-continent of Australia had completed the process of differentiation into separate provinces, locally autonomous, and entirely independent of each other—a process not even yet at an end, for Queensland, South Australia, and Western Australia all await subdivision—the more far-seeing of Australian statesmen recognized that, when the several communities thus thrown off from the single root had reached the further process of integration and developed into distinct States, each with its own specialized interests and characteristics, some common bond would become necessary to reunite them, for purposes outside the sphere of local self-government, into what the Britons of the Southern Seas are proud to speak of as the Australian “nation” of the future. (The compatibility of such a national ideal with the indefinite continuance of the Imperial connection will be referred to later on ; but incidentally only, as the object of the present paper is to give some account of the actual position and prospects of colonial federation without any ulterior reference). Public men and public writers had long been accustomed to refer from time to time to the ultimate need of a federal union ; but it was not until the year 1889 that the idea took definite shape and bore fruit in any practical action. In that year the con-

dition of affairs in the Western Pacific—the labour question, and the general lawlessness existing among the various groups of islands in those seas, coupled with the fear of foreign aggression and territorial acquisition at the gates of Australia—engaged the serious attention of both the Imperial and the Colonial Governments. Lord Derby, then Colonial Secretary, suggested to the Agents-General the confederation of the colonies as offering a solution of the problem by providing a power on the spot sufficiently strong to grapple with the difficulty. To this the Agents-General, while agreeing that concerted action was desirable for the purpose in hand, replied that the large question of federation raised was one on which the colonies had not made up their minds, and “is one of too great moment to be decided even under the sway of the strong feelings which now exist among them respecting the policy which ought to be pursued in the Western Pacific.” This language was used in a memorandum addressed to Lord Derby by the Agents-General for New South Wales, New Zealand, Queensland, and Victoria on July 21, 1883. On November 28, 1883, a Conference or (as it was officially styled) Convention was held at Sydney, at which all the colonies of Australasia were represented; and at that Conference were discussed not only the pressing questions relating to the Western Pacific, the immediate object of its meeting, but the question of the institution of a permanent federal body; nor was this question discussed only, but carried to the length of the adoption by the Conference of a draft Bill, then laid before it by some of the delegates, for the establishment of a Federal Council of Australasia. That draft Bill was passed into law with certain amendments by the Imperial Parliament, receiving the Royal assent on August 14, 1885. Before the end of the same year it had been adopted by the legislatures of a sufficient number of colonies to bring it (according to its provisions) into operation; and on January 25, 1886, the first session of the newly-constituted Federal Council was opened in Hobart.

The measure of federation thus introduced was a small one only; but it is important to bear in mind that it was recognized and intended by those who took part in framing it as nothing more than a first instalment. Although the first step was tentative and provisional, yet it was of prime significance as admitting and sanctioning the principles of federal action; and the resolution of the Conference adopting the draft Bill went further, inasmuch as it recognized by implication the desirability and attainability of “a complete Federal Union of the Australasian Colonies” at some future day. These facts it is as well to call attention to, before giving the brief account that follows of the powers of the Council under the Act, from which the limited and partial character of the present federation will be readily apparent.

In the first place, the Act is of course only permissive: neither

directly or indirectly was any attempt made by the Convention which framed the measure to coerce the Government or people of any colony into joining the federal union. As a matter of fact, up to the present time, not even all those colonies whose representatives were personally pledged to the movement have come in. It is left to the legislature of each colony to adopt the Act or not at its discretion, and no act of the Council has the force of law in any colony outside the federation. Secondly, the legislative authority of the Council is confined to certain matters, principally relating to what may be termed "foreign affairs" and extra-territorial jurisdiction, detailed in the Imperial Act, and to such matters of a specified nature as may be referred to it by the legislatures of any two of the federated colonies; in regard to which latter power it is provided that its exercise shall apply only to such colonies as either originally make the reference or subsequently adopt the legislation. Renewed powers are also contained in the Act relating to the reference to the Council of other matters by her Majesty in Council, or the governors of colonies, at the request of the colonial legislatures. No reference has as yet been made under either of these provisions, and they do not at present appear likely to become operative. Thirdly, the right of "secession" is expressly reserved to the legislature of every colony that joins the federation. This crucial point was naturally the subject of much debate and difference of opinion; the adhering colonies contending from the first that its acceptance rendered the whole Act nugatory; others hesitating to take a step that would be irrevocable. The former view is undoubtedly the true one, when such a provision is applied to a complete federation such as that of the Canadian Dominion; but, having regard to the purely experimental and partial nature of the present scheme, it is not a matter of surprise that the latter view was ultimately adopted by Parliament. Lastly, the Council is entrusted with no executive functions whatever, and, as a consequence, with no financial powers. And, apart from these limitations in the constitutional position of the Council, it is to be observed that numerically it is quite a small body—if all the colonies were represented in it the total of its members would be only fourteen—so that it could not, on that account alone, if on no other, be regarded as a thoroughly representative body.

When the Council first met in 1886, three self-governing colonies, Queensland, Victoria, and Tasmania, and the only two Crown colonies of the group, Western Australia and Fiji, had availed themselves of the provisions of the Imperial Act. Although that session produced one or two useful pieces of legislation, chiefly of a legal and formal character, and was distinctly serviceable in enabling the colonies represented to speak with a united voice on the questions, just then passing through a stage of exacerbation, connected

with French aggressiveness in New Caledonia and the New Hebrides, yet it was felt that the principal significance of the meeting of the Council lay in the fact of its having met at all; and it was acknowledged on all sides that, so long as the three very important colonies of New South Wales, New Zealand, and South Australia stood aloof, the Council could not but be regarded as an imperfect if not an abortive body. Partly on this account, and partly perhaps in view of the impending Imperial Conference of that year, no session was held in 1887; while the session of 1888 was held for the sake of preserving the Council from dying a natural death under the provisions of the Act, which necessitate a session once at least in every two years.

The reader will now perceive in how vital a sense the issue of the recent session has been described as critical. Without the accession of further strength the existence of the Council was an admitted futility; while, to continue holding *pro forma* sessions every two years until it should be the good pleasure of the other colonies to give in their adhesion, would hardly have comported with the dignity of the colonies already represented. The motives which have conduced to keep the outstanding colonies from joining the Council are not identical, and in each case are probably of a mixed character. In New Zealand it is the accepted creed of a large number of people that the policy of the colony should be to "play a lone hand" and not mix itself up politically with the Australian continent, between whose interests and its own important divergences are believed to exist. The federal spirit appears not to have been abroad in New Zealand hitherto, if we may judge from the tone adopted by her representatives when the Federal Bill was under discussion between the Imperial and Colonial Governments. Certainly the arguments adduced on the part of New Zealand against the Bill were such as cut at the root of all federation, and were many of them of a very weak character, whether regarded from a logical or a political point of view. However, there is some reason to believe that a juster apprehension of the situation has since become more prevalent. In the case of South Australia and New South Wales the causes of abstention were less deep-seated, and to be looked for rather in the exigencies of local politics and party strife, coupled in the case of New South Wales with a chronic jealousy of Victoria, and a disinclination to stand upon equal terms with the smaller colonies, or even, in the minds of some at least of her politicians, to join any movement or combination in which she, as the parent colony, should not be accorded a distinct and leading place—a kind of hegemony, such as Athens possessed in the confederacy of Delos, while she was still only *primus inter pares*; for to such a position New South Wales has always seemed more or less openly to aspire. Be these things as they may, South Australia has actually come in, and those

in a position to form an opinion are more sanguine than before, that the time is now not far distant when both the other colonies of Australasia will be included in the federation. Apart from personal and political changes in the particular colonies themselves, calculated to co-operate towards the same end, this opinion is based principally on the two great events that have taken place in reference to the Federal Council since the *pro forma* session of 1888. One of these events is the accession to the Council of the important colony of South Australia, whereby the non-federating minority is reduced to two, and, as regards Australia proper, to New South Wales alone; and the other is the amendment of the constitution of the Council, initiated by the last comer, and determined upon at the recent session of 1889. The importance of the first of these events speaks for itself. The amendment of the constitution, both as to that which was effected and that which was left undone, is a matter deserving some examination.

There were two directions in which the Council discussed the amendment of its constitution. One related to the increase of its numbers; the other to the mode of appointing representatives. As originally constituted the Council consists of two members from each colony enjoying responsible government, and one each from Crown colonies, making, as has been already mentioned, a total of fourteen if all the colonies were represented. This number the Council has now decided should be increased to thirty-three, or, when Western Australia obtains (as anticipated) responsible government, thirty-four. This number, it is both interesting and significant to remark, is one or two in excess of the number of delegates attending the Quebec Conference which produced the Federal Parliament of the Canadian Dominion, and only five short of that of the deputies who signed the Constitution of the United States of America. The mere increase of its numbers is obviously calculated to render the Council a more authoritative as well as a more representative body. But its representative character is further enhanced by the method upon which the increase is made. If the model of the first constitution had been followed, the number from each colony would have been increased equally. But it was determined to depart from this principle of representation by States alone, and to give some weight to the numerical superiority of one State over another. "Some" weight only, however. The plan adopted does not go to the opposite extreme of making numbers the sole basis of representation; but bridges the difficulty of reconciling in a single chamber the two essential elements of a true federal polity, representation by local units and by population. This is effected by means of a scale of representation graduated according to numbers in a diminishing ratio to their increase. Thus, a colony of less than 100,000 is to have two representatives; but one with 700,000 will not have seven



times as many, or fourteen, but only six. Seven hundred thousand is the maximum of population entitling to an increase of representatives; so that Victoria, and when she comes in, New South Wales, each numbering about a million inhabitants, will still have only the maximum of six members in the Council. The actual gradations were evidently not fixed upon any *a priori* plan, but to suit the existing numbers of the various colonies; and the adjustment seems to be a reasonably fair one, and does not depart too far from the fundamental principle of State representation by giving too absolute a preponderance to mere numbers.

The other problem, as to the system of selecting representatives, was found to be beset with much more serious difficulties. Hitherto each colony has been at liberty to appoint its representatives how it will; and the local legislatures have ordained that representatives shall be nominated and appointed by the Governor in Council in each colony, which means, of course, by the Ministry of the day in the parliamentary colonies, who have in most instances confined the appointments to members of their own bodies. The latest enactment, however, on this point, that of South Australia, provides that after the first nomination the power of appointment shall lie with the legislature. With this principle of individual freedom the Council did not see its way to interfere, and after careful deliberation it refrained from recommending any uniform method of selection. In thus abstaining from any action that might bear even the semblance of dictation, the Council, as at present constituted, probably exercised a wise discretion, having regard especially to the susceptibilities of the two colonies still outstanding. The larger and (as may be hoped) more fully representative Council will be in a position to further amend its constitution in this respect if it is thought desirable, or rather, as is necessary in all cases that entail an amendment of the organic statute, to recommend fresh legislation by the Imperial Parliament. In the meanwhile, it is much to be hoped, and indeed may be expected, that, with the increased number of appointments to be made, the several colonial legislatures will provide some method of election (as distinguished from nomination) for at least half of their representatives. Direct popular election is not called for in the case of a body such as the Council will still be, until it develops into a Federal Parliament. Secondary election by the legislatures would best meet the case. It is also much to be desired that the range of qualification for membership should at the same time be extended so as to render eligible persons not having a seat in the local legislatures, the present qualification in all cases; though it is doubtful whether the "politicians" will be prepared to do this of their own motions. But those who know the composition of colonial parliaments will endorse the statement that, if their members alone remain eligible, the Federal Council will lose the

services of the majority of the best men in the colonies, who, for the most part, unhappily, take no part in local politics.

There is another point as to which some critics of the action of the Council in the amendment of its constitution find fault with it, namely, that no attempt was made to increase its powers. The considerations just now referred to, as justifying the Council in declining to touch the question of selecting representatives, afford also an answer to these objections. Moreover, the formal authority of the Council is already in excess of its actual power of exercising it. When it feels itself more firmly seated in the political saddle, it can do much without any additional powers, and can, moreover, then, without hesitation, ask for such an addition as it may deem necessary. For the present, by increasing its own aggregate numbers, and by recognizing the claims of superior numerical strength in the constituent States to larger representation, the Council has done much to satisfy the requirements of New South Wales, and perhaps also of New Zealand. By what it has done in this direction, and, it may be added, by what it has left undone in other directions, to some extent for the avowed purpose of conciliating the outstanding colonies, the Council may certainly claim to have done all that in it lay to induce New South Wales to complete the federation of continental Australia, and New Zealand to abandon her studied attitude of isolation from the group of sister States with whom and in whose destiny her own truer and deeper interests must in the long run be bound up.

It is evident, then, that one very great step forward has been taken. But the most promising feature of the present situation is the general recognition that it is but a step in a continuous process of development. This has been the dominant note of the discussion. The report on the amendment of the constitution adopted by the Council expressly keeps in view "the ultimate establishment of a more perfect system of federal union"; and recognizes that "further amendments of the constitutions of the Council will from time to time become necessary, until complete Parliamentary federation is eventually obtained." These aspirations received explicit and direct avowal and additional emphasis in a substantive declaration, moved and carried, independently of the constitutional amendment, in the form of an abstract resolution, inviting the future Council, after re-constitution, to proceed to the consideration of the question of Australasian Parliamentary Federation. When the lines of the Federal parliament of the future come to be laid down, Australia will not be without the guidance of such precedents as are afforded by the constitutions of two existing federations of English-speaking races under circumstances not altogether dissimilar to her own. The constitution of the United States presents an example of Federal institutions that are perhaps altogether *sui generis*; yet the historical experience of that constitution will serve to teach many valuable lessons. The more recent federation of the Dominion of Canada will probably be found to

suggest methods more in harmony with the political condition and tenets of the Australasian colonies. But, whatever modifications of either or both systems be ultimately adopted, it is of vital importance that certain great principles be kept close hold of. There is probably no fear that the principle of representation by States, as such, on an equal footing, side by side with the representation of population, will be lost sight of. But there is perhaps some reason to doubt whether another principle, applicable to other as well as federal forms of representative government, will meet with universal support. There is a paragraph in the Report already referred to which speaks of the election of representatives by constituencies of the people in a way which suggests that the present members of the Federal Council might scarcely acknowledge the value of having one branch of the federal legislature elected by some other means than by the direct voice of manhood suffrage; and there were passages in some of the speeches delivered that give colour to this apprehension. Those who have any doubt as to the side on which wisdom lies would do well to read again the passage in which De Tocqueville contrasts the vulgar obscurity of the United States House of Representatives, elected directly by the constituencies, with the ability and distinction to be found in the Senate, returned by secondary election of the several State legislatures.\* It is only too possible that to the ultra-Democratic peoples of the Australasian colonies no system may eventually commend itself which imposes any check upon the immediate and absolute sway of the popular voice. If such extreme counsels prevail, federated Australia will, it is to be feared, "incur no small risk" (as the same author says) "of perishing miserably among the shoals of democracy."

In concluding this imperfect review of the present position and future prospects of Australasian Federation, it may perhaps (in partial fulfilment of a promise made in an earlier paragraph referring to Australian "national" aspirations) be permitted to the writer, as one who has much at heart the cause of that larger federal union of the whole Empire which some still regard as an empty dream, or at best a counsel of perfection, to express the satisfaction which all who share such aspirations must experience in seeing our second great group of colonies following in the wake of Canada and gradually drawing together into the form and dignity of a nation. When each great group has succeeded in attaining to that status, then (the Australian Natives' Association and other sporadic manifestations of the separatist spirit, notwithstanding) the time will have come when a federation of the Empire will be recognized not only as a practical possibility but as a political necessity.

ROBERT J. BEADON.

HOBART, TASMANIA.

\* It appears from the *Times*' review of Mr. Bryce's new work on America (which had not itself yet reached the part of the world where these lines were written) that the modern observer takes a less favourable view of the Senate than that of his French predecessor of half-a-century ago.

## INDEPENDENT SECTION.

[Under the above title a limited portion of THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW is occasionally set apart for the reception of able Articles, which, though harmonizing with the general spirit and aims of the Review, may contain opinions at variance with the particular ideas or measures it advocates. The object of the Editors in introducing this department is to facilitate the expression of opinion by men of high mental power and culture, who, while they are zealous friends of freedom and progress, yet differ widely, on special points of great practical concern, both from the Editors and from each other.]

---

## THE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF RELIGIOUS LIFE.

### PART I.

"If there is one thing which a comparative study of religions places in the clearest light, it is the inevitable decay to which every religion is exposed." These words, taken from the Introduction to Professor Max Müller's *Chips from a German Workshop*, will doubtless come with a shock to the mind of the orthodox reader, for it is one of the signs of the remarkable influence which religion exercises over the human mind, that while all things else are admittedly in perpetual change or transformation, religion itself is said to be the one exception to the universal law. Every believer looks upon his own religion, or, at any rate, the fundamental doctrines of his religion, as the veritable "Rock of Ages"—the one eternal, unchangeable Truth. The above quotation from Professor Müller, altered so as to apply to anything other than religion, would sound but the stalest of platitudes; applied to religion, it strikes the note of contention which so often gives to religious controversy an especial bitterness, for there can be nothing more distressing to the mind of the devout worshipper than the suggestion that he is worshipping at a false shrine.

To the student of religions, however, this fact stands out clear and distinct—that the religious life, in all its forms and aspects, is subject to the law of evolution. To him, it is not only the physical universe—from the tiniest weed to the stateliest oak, from the sands

on the sea-shore to the granite hills—which is in a state of perpetual transformation, but also the thoughts and feelings of the human mind, the latter being subject to the universal law perhaps in greater degree than are the objects of the physical world, for the impressionable and sensitive mental states of man are acted upon by ten thousand “hidden suckers” which incline him now this way, now that, keeping his emotional, moral, and intellectual being—his mind—in continual flux.

And, as with the individual mind, so with systems of thought and religion; the law of evolution affects not merely each separate religion, but, through these, the whole of the religions of the world. The enormous influence which Judaism had upon Christianity, is sufficient illustration of the latter point, while as to the operation of the law of evolution on separate religions, I need only refer to the development, or, indeed, the transformation, of Christianity itself. From the Galilean era, the primitive stage of Christianity, through the age of Gnosticism and the metaphysical schools, through the centuries during which Christianity, under the form of Ecclesiasticism or Roman Catholicism, rose to the height of its power, and again through the period in which we see the rise and establishment of Protestantism and its off-shoots, we may clearly and certainly trace the development of the Christian religion. We may, indeed, point to certain eras and say: “There Paganism began to decline, here Christianity became the dominant religion;” but no man can lay his hand on any particular epoch and say: “There Paganism was extinguished, here Christianity was established.” There is a slow decline of the one, a gradual development of the other. The methods of thought, the ceremonies, the practices, and the institutions of the one, assist in the evolution of the other, and the Christian religion is indirectly influenced by Paganism, just as we in the nineteenth century are influenced by Roman law and Greek philosophy. The thought of one age, in religious as in secular matters, is bound to leave its impress on succeeding generations.

This process of development may be clearly discerned in the vague unrest which characterizes modern Christianity. There is a tendency to broaden theological doctrine; the interpretation of Scripture varies with the progress of knowledge—passages which were accepted as literal a generation or two ago being now looked upon as figurative or allegorical. Church of England ministers express doubts as to the truth and morality of certain of the Thirty-nine Articles; the doctrine of eternal torment, once vehemently upheld as a restraint on evil-doing, is now generally discredited. Even the most intolerant sections of the Church are influenced, perhaps unconsciously, by the liberal spirit of the age.

This change in religious belief is, however, too obvious to need further insistence upon. We are thus brought face to face with

this most striking fact, that, independent of the *form* which religion may take, there is a progressive continuity in the religious instinct and the religious life. Roman Catholicism, in the Middle Ages attempted to break this continuity, to enchain the human mind to a fixed belief. It was an impossible task, as impossible, indeed, as to chain down the earth and release it from obedience to the law of gravitation. Development is an absolute necessity. If, then, there is a progressive continuity in religious instinct and religious life, it necessarily follows that on the decline of Christianity the religious life would still continue to manifest itself in other and superior forms.

There may be some, however, who, while accepting, or perhaps partially accepting, the theory of evolution as it affects religion, would demur to this conclusion; who would say that though there have been, and still are, differences in the manifestation of religious life, yet there can be but one true religion, and that this is to be found in all its fulness and perfection in the Revelation which God has made to man. To such objectors it is necessary to present a different argument; to show them that truth and goodness are not peculiar to any particular religion, or to any divinely-favoured section of humanity, but that these belong, in certain measure, to the whole of mankind. For religion, on its subjective side, is essentially a *striving after something higher*—wherever this is found, consciously or unconsciously manifested, there is the true religious spirit. And in most, if not in all, of the religions of the world we find this element in varying degree. In Hinduism, in Buddhism, in Mohammedanism, as well as in Christianity, it is largely manifested. In the sacred books of each of these religions there are precepts which are not only of a kindred character, but which are identical in spirit and in meaning. A few examples will illustrate and enforce my argument. "He who cleaveth firmly unto God is already directed into the right way. Let there be people among you who invite to the best religion, and command that which is just, and forbid that which is evil."<sup>1</sup> "Verily God commandeth justice and the doing of good, and the giving unto kindred what shall be necessary; and He forbiddeth wickedness, and iniquity, and oppression: He admonisheth you that ye may remember."<sup>2</sup> "Your Lord knoweth well that which is in your souls; whether ye be men of integrity: and He will be gracious unto those who sincerely return unto Him."<sup>3</sup> "Whatever is in heaven and earth singeth praise unto God; and He is mighty and wise. He is the first and the last; the manifest and the hidden; and He knoweth all things. He causeth the night to succeed the day, and He causeth the day to succeed the night, and He knoweth the innermost parts of men's

<sup>1</sup> *The Koran*, chap. iii., Sale's translation. <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* chap. xvi. <sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* chap. xvii.

breasts. Believe in God and His Apostle, and lay out in alms a part of the wealth whereof God hath made you inheritors."<sup>1</sup>

Again, from the older religions of the East we have such passages as the following: "I will proclaim as the greatest of all things, that one should be good, praising only righteousness. Ahuramazda will hear those who are bent on furthering all that is good. May He, whose goodness is communicated by the good mind, instruct me in his best wisdom."<sup>2</sup> "We worship Ahuramazda, the righteous master of righteousness. We praise all good thoughts, all good words, all good deeds which are and will be done, and we likewise keep clean and pure all that is good. O Ahuramazda, thou righteous happy being! we strive to think, to speak, to do, only what of all actions may be best fitted to promote the two lives (that of the body and that of the soul)."<sup>3</sup> "We worship righteousness, the all-good, all that is very excellent, beneficent, immortal, illustrious, everything that is good."<sup>4</sup>

"If, friend, thou thinkest thou art self-alone, remember there is the silent thinker (the Highest Self) always within thy heart, and he sees what is good and what is evil."<sup>5</sup> "There is one eternal thinker, thinking non-eternal thoughts; He, though one, fulfils the desires of many. The wise who perceive Him within their self, to them belongs eternal life, eternal peace."<sup>6</sup> "Varuna is merciful even to him who has committed sin."<sup>7</sup>

"Avoid doing all wicked actions, practice most perfect virtue, thoroughly subdue your mind; that is the doctrine of the Buddha."<sup>8</sup> "Deeds that are hurtful to oneself, and deeds that are wrong, are easy to do; deeds that are beneficial and that bring happiness, they are difficult to do."<sup>9</sup> "The reward of virtue is happiness; he who has made that his goal will speedily find perfect rest and Nirvâna."<sup>10</sup>

The reader will perceive the similarity between these passages and many in the Old and New Testaments. I may observe, however, that I am not here invidiously comparing the religions of the East with Christianity; indeed, I am quite willing to admit that every religion should be judged as a whole rather than by its separate parts, that the unity and harmony of the doctrines promulgated should be taken into consideration in determining the worth and the originality of any religious faith. What I wish to insist upon is this: that the central principle of the ancient religions is

<sup>1</sup> *The Koran*, chap. lvii.

<sup>2</sup> *Zend-Avesta, Yasna*, xlv. 6. *Vide Haug's Essays on the Religion of the Parsis*, p. 163. Second edition.

<sup>3</sup> *Yasna*, xxxv. 1, 2, 3. *Vide Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Yasna*, xxxvii. 4. *Vide Ibid.*

<sup>5</sup> *Laws of the Mânava*, viii. 92. *Vide F. Max Müller's India: What can it teach us?* p. 74.

<sup>6</sup> From the *Upanishads*. *Vide Ibid.* p. 248.

<sup>7</sup> *Rig-veda*, vii. 87, 7. *Vide F. Max Müller's Chips from a German Workshop*, vol. i. p. 41.

<sup>8</sup> *Dharmatrâta*, translated from the Buddhist Canon, by W. W. Rockhill, p. 133.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* p. 135.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* p. 154.

really identical with that of Christianity. In each, there is the same indestructible element of belief in the triumph of good over evil. The powers of light are opposed to the powers of darkness; Indra (the god of the sky) to Vritra (the demon of night); Ormuzd (the principle of good) to Ahriman (the power of evil), just as the idea of God is opposed to the idea of the Devil, good to evil, in our own day. It is immaterial to our present inquiry whether the doctrine taught is that there are two opposing principles of good and evil, or that there is only one force in Nature, the various manifestations of which produce good and evil accordingly; the result is the same—there is a striving to accept and perpetuate the good, and to reject and destroy the evil.

This similarity, which is so apparent in a general view of the religions of the world, also manifests itself in the lives of the best of the adherents of each religion. Sakya-Muni, in the purity, devotion, and renunciation of his life, is, like Jesus, typical of sublime saintliness; Marcus Aurelius stands far higher than any of the Christian sovereigns of modern times—foretold, let us hope, of the time when philosophers shall be kings; and many of the ancient philosophers were imbued with as high a moral spirit as were the Christian saints. The truth is, there can be no equitable division or comparison based on difference in religious doctrine. The attempt which has lately been made to divide mankind into the spiritual and the non-spiritual, the natural man being regarded as spiritually dead, fails at the very outset by the absurdity of the assumption. Wherever there is conscientious thought, or conscience, there is the germ of spirituality; wherever there is a striving after righteousness, there is the basis of the religious life. The outward working or example of this spirit may be denominated differently by different individuals; one may term acts of goodness the "grace of God" manifested in one's earthly life, another may say that good actions spring from "a love and a reverence for humanity." There is only a difference of names. The real feeling underlying the various terms is the same, yesterday, to-day, and for ever. The scientist, in investigating natural phenomena, may name and classify the laws which govern these, but though the names may alter as experience widens, the underlying force ever remains the same. The biologist, in examining the diverse forms of life and the functions manifested in each, classifies and names the various forms and functions, but though the classification may vary and the name change, each function still continues its manifestation. So, the theologian, in analyzing the ideas and motives which occupy the human mind, builds up from these his creed and doctrine, and imagines that he has formulated the true religion; but the creed and the doctrine pass away, while the underlying principles and motives which impel to moral and religious endeavour still remain and influence mankind. Theology is changeable, evanescent, the religious spirit is



permanent, and inherent in the human mind. There is a substratum of universal truth and goodness which is independent of all theological dogmas.

Thus do we find, 'by a reference to the intellectual and moral growth of man, that the religious life, in one or other of its forms, is essential to humanity; that the striving after truth and goodness is not confined to any particular sect or creed, but is, in varying degrees, an element of all.

Seeing, then, that Christianity is but one amongst many forms of religion, all of which are founded on a principle or sentiment which is inherent in the human mind, my task is largely simplified, for it resolves itself into, first, a consideration of the disintegrating tendencies of modern thought on orthodox beliefs; second, an outlining of the *necessarily* religious and moral effects which would follow the decadence of orthodox Christianity. The sincere and earnest Christian, whose mind has been imbued with the belief that Christianity is the true faith, that it contains within itself the divinest moral sanctions and the potentiality of all good, may well be dismayed at the thought of its decay. He may, indeed, conscientiously ask himself whether man, deprived of the consolations of that religion which he has so long held sacred, will not sink into immorality and dissoluteness; whether, in such a contingency, our Christian civilization will not decline and fall as previous civilizations have fallen. But if he can be brought to see that every form of religion is subject to the law of evolution; that, with the loosening of the traditional bonds of morality, there arise, with the concurrent intellectual reformation, higher motives and sanctions; that the moving, or dynamic, or relative element in human life, is constantly striving to place itself in harmony with the ideal good, then an important step is taken towards catholicity of thought. That moment the theologian tacitly, if not willingly, admits that there is a moral and emotional basis for all religions; that, on the decline of any particular faith, the general law of development would still hold good, and that man, instead of slipping his moral moorings, would cling to the higher and nobler sanctions which are the possession of our common humanity.

Before proceeding to the next division of my subject it will be well to again draw the attention of the reader to the important fact already insisted upon, a fact which is, indeed, implied in the very word "evolution," and which it is imperative to bear clearly in mind in discussing the future development of religious thought, namely, that the immediate substitution of one religion for another is an impossibility, but that the religious life of one age is bound to bear the impress of that of preceding ages. Although this is really a truism, and is implied in all that I have yet written, its importance and bearing cannot be too strongly insisted upon, for orthodox

people have a tendency to regard opponents as the apostles or expounders of a new religion in 'contradistinction to the old, and exclaim: "If you think you have a better religion than ours, formulate your faith, and let us examine your creed so that we may see if it will bear comparison with ours;" as though religion were a ready-made article, whereas it is really a *growth*. It is this difference between manufacture and growth which is the real root of the difference between theology and religion. Theology deals with the supernatural and its relation to the human; religion deals with the human in its relation to the ideal and to the eternal mystery of which human life is a part. While theology stereotypes the supernatural, anatomizes God, and fixes the ideal, treating these as an architect treats his plans of some magnificent building, religion regards the Supreme Power as, in its essence, unknowable, and leaves room for the expansion and growth of the ideal. True, religion has a theoretic basis, but this is not to say that it is necessarily theologic, any more than to say that a theory of art or of music is theologic.

This, then, is the fundamental difference between the theologian and the truly religious man—the one formulates his infallible creed and lays down a fixed plan of salvation; whilst the other, regarding religious life as a growth, seeks to direct that growth aright, to free it from noxious weeds, to purify the highest instinct in man's nature from the degrading influence of the superstitions of preceding ages.

Here, then, we are brought to the all-important question—If there is a basal element or principle which is peculiar to all religions, what is that principle? Or, with special reference to Christianity, what is the underlying principle on which it is built, and which will remain when the Christian religion has passed away? By due consideration of these questions we shall be able to obtain a clear idea as to what is essential and what is non-essential to true religion, and we can then forecast, with some degree of precision, the probable consequences which will follow the decay of theological creeds, and the consequent stronger growth of the religious instinct.

I have already defined religion as a *striving after something higher*, and it is the recognition of this all-pervading "something" which is the basal element of all religions. No matter what name is given to it—"God," "Nature," "The Unknowable," "The Beyond," "The Eternal, not ourselves, which makes for Righteousness"—this something is recognized by all civilized beings. And even amongst the uncivilized there is a similar though narrower conception:

"Lo, the poor Indian, whose untutored mind,  
Sees God in clouds, or hears him in the wind."

This, then, is the foundation of the religious sentiment—the recognition of, and, in various forms, sympathy with, the Invisible. It is this resistless, this overpowering sense of the reality and per-

manence of the Invisible which forms the basis of man's conception of the Supreme, and it is essential that we obtain some idea as to the further evolution of this conception, for, as this varies, so will the religious life assume new phases. Hitherto, the popular conception of God has been narrow and limited—a vague notion of an extraordinary Being with human sensibilities and powers largely magnified. Of course, this conception varies according to the mental constitution of each individual, and becomes wider in proportion as the mind is susceptible to the influence of culture. But in this conception of the Supreme, whether held by the adherent of the Salvation Army or by the orthodox dignitary of the Church, there is one and the same inherent defect; that is, that God is supposed to be an all-wise and all-powerful *Person*, who has arranged the life of mankind according to a certain plan, and who will ultimately reward or punish His children according as they believe or disbelieve in the divine authorship and wisdom of this plan. This is the cardinal defect. Out of this there flow, as, indeed, there must necessarily flow, numerous other defects which vary in the same measure as the creeds of the different sections of the Church vary; defects which are part of the assumed divine plan—the doctrine of the Incarnation, the Trinity, the Atonement, the plenary inspiration of Scripture, Justification by Faith, and numerous others pertaining to the orthodox theology. It never seems to occur to the upholders and defenders of this plan, that, after all, it may not be the expression of the Divine Will, but merely the outcome of their own imagination, or of the imagination of their forefathers, as to how the Divine Will *should* manifest itself—their own pet idea as to what the plan of the universe should be. And the principal recommendation of this imaginary scheme of divine government is said to be its preciseness and definiteness of character, thereby giving to man a body of doctrine according to which he can frame and control the conduct of life. But when we come to examine this scheme of theology, we really find that, *for us*, one of its chief characteristics is its indefiniteness, an indefiniteness arising from the initial step—the anthropomorphic presentment of the Deity. Of course, in a certain sense, all presentments of the Supreme must be anthropomorphic. But the anthropomorphism of the orthodox theologian and that of the adherent of the Church of the future differ in this—that whilst the anthropomorphism of the one is *essential*, or inherent in the conception (a Being with human powers largely magnified), that of the other is *accidental*, and is occasioned by the *inadequacy of language* in portraying man's conception of the Eternal. These anthropomorphic conceptions of the Deity must then, I say, be both indefinite and impermanent, varying with every individual and at different periods of life with one and the same individual. Indefinite, because the personality is bound to be vague; we are never quite

sure how much of man and how much of God there is in the conception; there may arise, now and then, some doubt as to the wisdom and justice of certain parts of the "plan." And the conception is necessarily impermanent, because it is an attempt by man, the finite, the transitional, to give a fixed presentment of that which is infinite, eternal. It is an attempt to stay the onward, ever-developing movement of the intellect. With every change in the conditions which determine the growth of the human mind there must come corresponding changes in man's conception of the Supreme Power, and thus there is a continual transformation, a gradual rejection and re-creation of religious, or rather, theological systems, a making and an unmaking of gods. The popular theological conception of the Deity must, then, go the way of the ruder presentments which have preceded it. Like the barbarous conceptions of savage tribes, the beautiful and more refined conceptions of Pagan polytheism, and the more ideal conceptions of the ancient religions of the East, this anthropomorphic presentment of the Supreme contains within itself the seeds of natural dissolution. The degrading familiarity with God, which is so prominent a characteristic of our popular theology, is therefore bound to pass away.

But though the Biblical presentment of the Deity is now tacitly rejected, at any rate by the "masses," it may be said that the conception of the Supreme which is likely to obtain in the immediate future will still be that of a Personal Being, shorn of the barbarous attributes with which popular theology has hitherto endowed Him. If this be the case, then a wave of purified Theism will doubtless pass over the religious life of the people, and the Unitarian body may look for a great accession of strength. Of this, however, there are at present no great signs. Still, it may not be out of place to consider for a few moments whether the Theistic conception of God is a legitimate one, and whether it is likely to have a paramount influence on religious thought. This conception I take to be that of a "Supreme Mind and Will, directing the universe, and holding moral relations with human life," which means, of course, nothing less than an Infinitely Perfect *Personal* God. Undoubtedly, this conception of the Supreme is quite natural and legitimate *if it is in accord with the emotional instincts of the believer*. (Note, however, in passing, that it is the contention of this essay that the Theistic conception of God is not now in accord with the emotional instincts of a large portion of mankind). From the emotional or the intuitional point of view Butler's argument in the *Analogy* is of no use—all depends on the state or quality of the emotional feeling possessed by the individual. It is really a question as to how many straws will break the camel's back, or, as Mr. Brooke in *Middlemarch* would say, one may trust and believe "up to a certain point, you know." Because there are difficulties connected with the Theist's conception of Divine government—

difficulties such as, for example, unmerited suffering, which is apparently at variance with the rule of an All-powerful yet Loving God, and the reason for which the sincere believer trusts will be made clear in God's own time; because there are these difficulties, I say, which the Theist overcomes by his faith in and reliance on the living God, that is no reason why he should be called upon by the orthodox theologian to accept further difficulties which shock his moral sense—to believe, for example, in an Almighty Being who will consign his children to eternal punishment for errors in belief. The state of the Theist's emotional feeling may be such that he would look upon such a Being as an unnatural monster limned by a crude imagination, rather than as an All-wise and Loving God. So with the Protestant, the fact that he accepts the doctrine of the infallibility of the Scriptures, and overcomes the difficulties of his belief by leaving the meaning of doubtful passages to be made manifest in God's own way, is no reason why he should be called upon to accept the further difficulties involved in the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church. Where the justification for belief is purely subjective there is nothing more to be said. It is useless to argue against a person's beliefs if he tells you that he *feels* they are true.

All this is, of course, from the standpoint of the emotions, and emotion knows no logic. The Theist, however, as we are well aware, does not stop here; he must descend into the arena of controversy, and give a reason for the faith which is in him. He prides himself, above all else, on being "rational" in his religion, and so he has to settle with Bishop Butler on the one hand and with Herbert Spencer on the other. Let it be distinctly understood, however, that the moment the Theist so descends into the arena of controversy, that moment does he leave the domain of religion for the arid subtleties of the dialectical fencing-room. And however fascinating to a certain order of mind dialectical exercise may be, it is too anarchic in its results, too fond of finding justification and proof for itself, to be prolific of divine religious life. Religion, on the other hand, manifested either in thought or in feeling, scorns proof, or rather, it is a proof in itself. It is not merely prolific, it is creative, intensifying the vital element in man, purifying Passion, ennobling the Ideal, exalting Enthusiasm, transforming, transmuting, transfiguring Life. Of the one, the hair-splitting and the casuistry of Scholasticism may be taken as the type; of the other, the life of a Christ, a Buddha, & St. Francis d'Assisi.

This, then, is the cardinal defect of Theism, that it loses its potency in the process of proof and justification. "He who excuses himself, accuses himself." Dr. Martineau in his latest work, *A Study of Religion: its Sources and Contents*, says:—"By religion I understand the belief and worship of Supreme Mind and Will, directing the universe and holding moral relations with human

life,"<sup>1</sup> and he forthwith proceeds to give justification of this conception of religion in two large volumes, which cover a large portion of the field of metaphysical research. Despite all Dr. Martineau's eloquence, however, we close the work with a feeling of sickness of heart at the thought that religion should require such portentous justification. Religion needs no such justification—irresistible and majestic in its sweep, it flashes forth its proof in the radiance of its martyr heroism. The antithesis of the religious instinct is the sceptical instinct; and scepticism—the real sceptical instinct—never is, never can be, enthusiastically religious. But let us beware of the misuse of terms. With scepticism towards lower forms of faith, there may be allied a passionate fervour for nobler ideals, a profounder reverence for higher faiths, and those whom the world has been ready to label with the name of "sceptic," have often been men and women of finest religious feeling.

Independent, however, of the fact that the positing of a Personal Deity leads the rational religionist into the debateable land of metaphysics, and that Theism thereby loses its potency as an effective religious faith, there is a further reason for supposing that it will never again touch the hearts of the people. I have already said that Theism is not really satisfying to the emotions of a large portion of mankind. This assertion will doubtless appear strange to those who are accustomed to place reliance on an infinitely loving Father, and who, in this thought of trust and reliance, find consolation for the wearied spirit and balm for the troubled soul. Yet the absence of trust is a quite natural consequence. Before a Being can inspire trust and reliance, the character and the workings of that Being must be such as will spontaneously generate these qualities in the hearts of his children. A kind and loving father, who entwines his child in his arms and fills its breast with a sense of his sustaining power, gives to the little one a natural feeling of trust and love which causes it to cling to its parent to the end of life. But a brutal father, who is callous to childish affections, who regards not the welfare of his little one, who wreaks cruel vengeance upon it for childish misdeeds, and fills its baby brain with continual apprehensions of his brutal fury—such a father can inspire no love and no trust. So with the Infinitely Perfect God of the Theist. The works of Nature are said to be the manifestation of God's infinite power and wisdom, and we are told to contemplate this manifestation of infinite power, the wonder, the beauty, the bounteousness of Nature, and give praise and glory to God. So we do. But when we remember that under every fair-seeming leaf there is a miniature world of woe; that the bird which at one moment thrills us with its song, may, at the next, hold a writhing worm in its jaws of death; that the dusky veil of night, with its setting of brilliant gems, is the pall of millions of

<sup>1</sup> Introduction, p. 16.

ephemera ; that every tread of our foot in the fields may leave scores of dead and maimed victims ; that the continuance of healthy vitality in one half the animal creation means the quivering death agony of the other half ; that, finally, this inconceivable amount of misery and suffering is not a mere accident in Nature, but is the very woof and framework of existence, the whole universe groaning and travelling with pain ; when we remember these things, I say, and are told by the Theist to give thanks and praise for *this*—we are dumb. Neither will the doctrine of Compensation suffice—this merely softens, it does not remove, the jar on our emotional feelings, for no compensation can wipe out the wrong of *unmerited* suffering. Thus, for us, the All-perfect, All-powerful, yet Loving *Personal* God of the Theist fades into nonentity—we *cannot* believe, because of the very excess of our emotional feeling.

But this line of argument will lead us to Atheism, it may be said. Not at all. Neither does it leave God “an open question.” We are still conscious of the illimitable presence of the Supreme. In the words of Herbert Spencer : “Amid the mysteries which become the more mysterious the more they are thought about, there will remain the one absolute certainty, that man is ever in the presence of an Infinite and Eternal Energy, from which all things proceed.” We know and feel that there is a *tendency* which makes for righteousness, and it is to this that we are willing to give praise and glory. But beyond this we cannot be called upon to go. We will praise the Good, but do not ask us to bow down to Evil. More of this anon, however, when we come to consider the reformatory influences at work on religious life.

It may be objected by both the Rationalist and the Agnostic, that I am here laying too much stress on “mere” emotion, that all such questions should be decided from the standpoint of Reason. By all means, let us appeal to Reason where such appeal is necessary, but let us not neglect subjective or intuitional experience. There has of late years been such an enthroning of Reason that one may be excused for thinking that the cultivation of the emotions is in danger of being neglected, and it may not be unwise to enter a protest, however feeble, against such a policy ; though, after all, the emotions form such an imperishable portion of man’s being that perhaps no permanent harm can arise from this temporary neglect. We are continually being told that religion must be “verified,” that it must rest upon a “demonstrable basis,” that it must have its warrant in “objective realities.” There is, indeed, no need nowadays to insist upon appeals to the reasoning faculties for the decision of religious questions, rather is there a need to insist upon such a wise cultivation of the emotions as will impregnate the religious sentiment with a more puissant vitality. However much the scientific method has accomplished in undermining the leading

tenets of the Christian faith amongst the cultured classes, with the great mass of the people emotion has been the most potent factor. The belief in the doctrine of eternal torment, for example, has passed away, not through the historical and critical researches of Biblical scholars impugning the accuracy and authenticity of New Testament records, but because the moral sense of the people has revolted at the doctrine. The fear sometimes expressed by devout people that religion will die away with the decadence of the old faith is most puerile, from the very fact that emotion, from which religion springs, is an indestructible element of man's being.

Nevertheless, by this transformation of religious thought, we are brought face to face with a very serious problem—not merely with the *question*, Does a Supreme Personal God exist? but with the *fact* that for the great mass of the people no such Being does exist. We have been building on a false foundation. The "Time-Spirit" is at work, and to attempt to destroy its influence by dialectical exercises on metaphysical questions would be a waste of energy. The results arising from this negative attitude of mind are serious, and must have a pernicious influence on the religious life of the people. Take, for example, the custom which is the natural outcome of a belief in a Supreme Power—*i.e.*, prayer or supplication. It is quite natural for one who is in great stress and danger to appeal to the One with whom he conceives he has some direct personal relation; it is, indeed, quite natural for the mind in which this conception of a Personal God exists to appeal for the satisfaction of even material wants. And thus we have in our churches those materialistic prayers for rain, for fair weather, for deliverance from plague or from famine, and even for victory in battle; or, in other words, a pious entreaty that this personal yet omniscient and loving Father of all may allow one portion of his children, who may be filled with a lust for conquest and dominion, to mercilessly slaughter some other portion of mankind, who may have the misfortune to be smaller in number than the first-named portion, and who may therefore be in greater need of the protection of an all-powerful and infinitely loving Father. But with the passing away of the old theological conception of a personal Deity, the custom and form of prayer must have a corresponding change, and it is gratifying to notice that in the Church itself such prayers as these are gradually coming to be looked upon as really blasphemous in their nature—an insult to the Providence whose interposition they invoke. The mind of man has become so thoroughly impressed with the uniformity of Nature that all appeals for the disturbance of that uniformity are rightly looked upon as useless. Thus the offering of prayer for the satisfaction of material wants will soon become a thing of the past.

As to the further changes which the custom of prayer is likely to undergo, this must be left for consideration at a later stage; here I



wish only to emphasize the fact that, by insisting so strongly on the doctrine of the Personality of God, and by inferring that the custom of prayer depends upon this crude conception of Deity, the theologians themselves have unconsciously done much to undermine the very spirit on which prayer is founded. And a similar danger attends the relation which the Bible has hitherto borne to the intellectual life of the nation. "Destroy the old conception of a Personal God," says the orthodox Christian, "and you depreciate the value and lessen the significance of the Scriptures." What reliance may be placed on this statement Matthew Arnold has well shown us. But the evil has been done and the danger is upon us. The "masses" read the newspaper instead of the Bible, or, at best, their reading is composed of a great deal of newspaper and very little Bible; but perhaps it is better that it should be so than that they should read their Bible wrongly. Compare the influence of the Scriptures to-day with their influence, say three hundred years ago; I mean in the intensity of that influence rather than in its extent. Then, to the great bulk of the people, the Bible was the only literature, and though they read it wrongly and gave it a false interpretation, yet it gave to them vivid conceptions of duty, grand ideals, and high purposes, and by these they were enabled to bind tyrant kings in chains, and, with hail of fire, scorch out of the land the immoral theory of "the right divine of kings to govern wrong." But the Bible gives us no such vivid conception of duty to-day, not because it does not possess the power of giving such conceptions, but because we have lost our base,—the people having been taught that the Bible is the revelation of a Personal Deity, the personality having vanished, they have, not unnaturally, come to regard the revelation as a myth, and disregard it accordingly.

Thus we see how the disintegrating forces at work on religious life accumulate and gather strength. And the great need of the time is to change these disintegrating forces into reformatory forces; to render possible a deeper, a truer expression of the religious spirit in man; to make all that is best in Christianity aid in developing that spirit; to revivify and intensify our conceptions of duty, and to make those conceptions the basis of a more resolute endeavour for the attainment of a high ideal of moral and social life. To do this, it is necessary that we admit to ourselves and recognize the fact that our conceptions of the Supreme have undergone, or are undergoing, a vital change. We need a readjustment of religious thought to the wider knowledge to which the human race has attained. There cannot be the least doubt that the break-up of the old faith will extend to the very foundation of religion—for the conception of the Supreme is the ground-idea of religious thought. And this is where the danger lies. But it is a danger which arises, not from intelligent disbelief in a Personal God, but from indifferentism, from unconscious

Atheism, if I may so term it. The people have been taught to expect so much from the "divine plan" of orthodox theology—the beneficence of a Personal Providence who would hearken to the prayer of the faithful, the remission of sin through Christ, the materialistic heaven, and the still more materialistic hell—that, with the loosening of the bonds of traditional belief, there may be some danger of a lapse into selfish indifferentism. Should this danger become a reality, however, there need be no fear of selfishness and indifferentism remaining permanent. The religious instinct in man is so strong, the desire to follow the truth and to act justly towards others has, generally speaking, become so inherent in man's nature, that it is almost impossible there can be any real and permanent weakening of these qualities. There are periods in human history when religious life seems devoid of potency, but this is no proof that religious life does not exist, it merely flows through unseen channels, gathering strength to burst forth with irresistible power at later periods. Thus, the religious life of the immediate future must be the fruition of the religious life of past ages. The loftier Paganism produced a type of character beautifully, divinely heroic; Christianity came and gave to that type the perfecting touch of saintliness, and Paganism, which was individualistic, became transformed by the new doctrine of the brotherhood of man. Slowly, gradually, the divinely heroic was lost sight of; the wealth, the exuberance, the genius of philosophic life was ready to perish in the formalism, the casuistry, of Scholasticism. Out of this apparent barrenness, however, sprang the Reformation, or, to speak more broadly, the enthusiasm, nay, the exaltation, of that reforming spirit which culminated in the fiery earnestness of the French Revolution. Again came the swing of reaction, and now, in these latter days, pure Christianity has lost its potency in the slough of a sordid, degrading, industrialism. But again, I say, this is no proof of the permanent decadence of the religious spirit. There are signs that mankind is reawakening to a sense of its position and duty, and it is in this reawakening that the religious life must again burst forth, blending the Stoic ideal with the Christian ideal, the divinely heroic with the saintly; giving to us once again the charm, the majesty of the golden age—men and women living in the grand, the god-like style:

"Alone, self-pois'd, henceforward man  
Must labour! must resign  
His all too human creeds, and scan  
Simply the way divine!"

Thus it will be seen how strong is the logical continuity in the manifestation of religious life. A continuity as strong as, because it is part of, human life itself. It is perhaps difficult for the mind to realize that the myriad experiences of past ages must exert their in-

fluence in each individual life of to-day, yet we cannot doubt that this influence, arising out of ancestral feelings, habits, prejudices, prepossessions, dogmas, does indeed mould the life of each generation. And it is this adamant chain of continuity in thought and life which gives us such great hope of the future, and prevents us from regarding the decadence of orthodox Christianity as the decadence of religion itself. As long as the human mind is constituted as it is, so long will it continue to ponder the old problems, so long will the insatiable curiosity of man prompt him to dig and delve at the old unplumbed mines. So long, too, will his labour be productive of the same results—systems of philosophy and systems of theology which differ only in symbol and in name. And the systems of philosophy wane and pass into oblivion, the systems of theology die away, and, like the Pagan women of old, we weep for our dead gods and bury them in shrouds woven out of dim, indefinable longings and hopes. But, as a bird renews its plumage, our ideals rise again, robed with a grander radiance, a diviner light, and our minds become endued with a larger hope, a firmer faith, a higher conception of duty, a clearer perception of the forms in which duty should manifest itself. The old shrines crumble to ruins and we build for ourselves new temples. Let us take care that the Temple of the Future be reared with loving hands and steadfast hearts, the remembrance of which shall nerve the worshippers therein to more heroic action, to saintlier life.

LAON RAMSEY.

## THE MALTHUSIAN THEORY OF POPULATION:

A REPLY TO "STATISTICS *VERSUS* MALTHUS."

THE latter part of the nineteenth century seems destined to be the epoch when truths, which have seemed almost axiomatic to those who hold them, are to be subjected again to the severest and most hostile criticism. Thus we read in our daily papers attacks upon the consumption of animal diet; on vaccination; on the law of population; and a number of other beliefs which have been for many years articles of the scientific creed of this and other nations of the West. Journals of the greatest distinction are found to follow this revolutionary tendency, and one curious example of this lies before me in the pages of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, once the most prominent exponent of the views of Malthus and the two Mills. In the March number of that famous periodical there is an article entitled "Statistics *versus* Malthus," in which the truth of the "law of population" usually called, after its most able expositor, "the Malthusian law," is flatly contradicted, and treated as if it were the mere offspring of a hasty generalization from the personal experience of a rather unscientific observer, which has had some ephemeral reputation. As far as authorities are concerned, however, the author of the article in question cites only a few modern writers on statistics to aid him in his task of disproving the Malthusian theory; for the works he quotes from are chiefly those of Edward Atkinson, an American statistician, Mulhall, Thorold Rogers, and Herbert Spencer; and he is even obliged to remonstrate with the last-named eminent author, because of his admission of the Malthusian theory. He might also have cited Mr. F. W. Newman. On the other hand, as Mr. Mill has said in his *Principles of Political Economy*, the theory of Malthus, after having been discussed for more than three generations since it was propounded, has been accepted so completely by all competent inquirers, that it may be looked upon as axiomatic. For instance, Ricardo, senior, Joseph Garnier, James and J. S. Mill, Brougham, Sismondi, Rossi, Say, Fawcett and Cairnes among those who have passed away, with Whately and Chalmers; and, among the living, the present Bishop of Manchester, and Archbishop of Canterbury, John Morley, the Duke of Argyll,

Lord Bramwell, Professor Bain, Cotter Morison, Leonard Courtenay, Huxley, Lord Salisbury, Lord Derby, and a perfect host of celebrities have, during this century, proclaimed their adhesion to the proposition of Malthus. So much for authority, which, however, is everything to the busy masses.

But, of course, all these able men may have been deceived, and hence it is necessary seriously to examine what arguments the writer in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW has forthcoming to prove the fundamental error of this widespread conviction. To my mind, his only arguments are based on a total misconception of the question at issue, for that is simply and solely, as I understand it, a physiological one. Every farmer is familiar with the problem of how long it will take for a flock of sheep or herd of oxen to double, if he have enough food to give them, and knows also that with a given acreage he must take care not to overstock his farm, in case there may not be enough "feed" for the stock. The human race, like other animals, has a like tendency to increase and multiply at a given rate, just as sheep or oxen have, and it has been calculated that a doubling of the race, if the birth-rate were about 50 per 1000 annually, which it has often been, might take place in from about ten to fifteen years.

In Malthus's *Essay on Population* (1806, p. 2) he states the case in the words of Benjamin Franklin, who observed that there was "no bound to the prolific nature of plants and animals, but what is made by their crowding and interfering with each other's means of subsistence. . . . Were the face of the earth," he says, "vacant of other plants, it might gradually be sown and overspread by one kind only, as, for instance, with fennel; and were it empty of other inhabitants, it might in a few ages be replenished from one nation only, as, for instance, with Englishmen." He further points out that in the case of plants and irrational animals the subject is a simple one, for these are all impelled by a powerful instinct to increase, and this instinct is interrupted by no doubt about being able to provide for their offspring. In man the effect of this instinct is more complicated, for, although he is equally impelled by it to increase, reason interrupts him in his career, and reminds him that he may bring children into the world whom he cannot find food for. If he attend to this voice of reason (as the modern French, or the inhabitants of the West End of London do), he will run the risk of being styled unnatural and vicious; if, on the contrary, he turns a deaf ear to that voice (as the modern Italians, or Belgians, or the inhabitants of the East End of London do), the race will be constantly endeavouring to increase beyond the means of subsistence. But as food is as requisite to the life of man as it is in the case of all animals, a strong check on population must always be felt in the latter case from the difficulty of getting sufficient food. This then was the gist of Malthusian teaching; and the truth of the theory

having been amply recognized by Mr. Charles Darwin and his followers, it may be truly said that it requires some strength of mind to hold out against the tendency of scientific opinion which has lately been expressed in the phrase "the struggle for existence" by prominent Darwinians.

And yet the author in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW alleges that "statistics show the conclusions of Malthus to be preposterous." He admits, indeed, that it is true that population might outrun the means of subsistence, if it were confined to a given area; but, he argues that, in this case, the deficiency of food would arise in the circumstances which caused the overcrowding, and not from the incapacity of the world to produce subsistence, as Malthus's doctrine had taught. That is to say, when translated into the language of a Malthusian, that the actually existing 14 hundred millions of the human race could easily obtain food from the whole world if they tried, so as to enable them to become 28 hundred millions in fifteen years; 56 hundred millions in thirty years; and 112 hundred millions in forty-five years. If the author does not go quite so far as this, he must, it seems to me, abandon his assertion as untenable. But perhaps he would be prepared to accept it, and to say that if the race were as free and as highly educated as he would wish it to be, they might increase as fast as this. I confess I utterly fail to enter into such an optimistic conception of the capacities of animals like ourselves as this amounts to.

That I am not singular in assuming that the animal man might double in fifteen years, if well supplied with food, I may cite a passage from Malthus's essay (1806, p. 7), where he shows that, according to Euler's table, if the births be to the deaths in the proportion of three to one, the period of doubling may only be twelve years. And these proportions are not only possible suppositions, but have actually occurred for short periods in more countries than one. Sir William Petty (*Political Arithmetic*, p. 14) supposes a doubling possible in so short a time as ten years. The human female commences to reproduce at the age of fifteen, and continues to have that power for thirty years, during which she may, and often does, produce from twelve to twenty children. Now, although this tendency to increase must have always existed in all nations, it is worth while mentioning the extreme slowness with which population increased before the commencement of the nineteenth century; that is, before the era of scientific agriculture in Europe. According to Adam Smith (*Wealth of Nations*) it took most of the European nations about 500 years to double their population in these hungry ages, whereas, as Malthus states (p. 6), in the Northern State of America, "where the means of subsistence have been more ample, the manners of the people purer, and the checks to marriage fewer than in any of the modern States of Europe, the population has been found to double itself, for

above a century and a half successively, in less than each period of twenty-five years." This sentence was written in 1806, long before the modern tide of European emigration was directed into the United States. He also notices that, from recent calculations, from the first settlement of America up to 1800, the period of doubling had been very little above twenty years, and in the back settlements, where the sole employment was agriculture, the population had been found to double in fifteen years. We may assume, then, that the race tends to double in fifteen years.

Our author holds that there is some other more recondite law of population (which, however, has not yet been admitted except by a select few), such as that poverty or scanty diet has the capability of making the race more prolific. "The affluent," he says, "notoriously, do not have the number of children that parents in straitened circumstances have." Let us examine this hypothesis, and see what it amounts to. Well, in the first place, the modern French are so prudent in the production of children that the families of the professional classes and peasant proprietors are found not to contain more than about two children. There is no need, however, of invoking the aid of any new law of population in this case, since it is obviously parental prudence, and not the blind forces of Nature at all, which produces this effect. On the other hand, the poorest classes certainly engender large families even in France; but this is merely because they are not so prudent as their richer neighbours, and clearly not because the latter are sterile. The residuum of truth contained in this ephemeral hypothesis, which originated, I think, with Doubleday, is that over-eating and laziness are opposed to vitality, and produce sterility and other diseases; but it is not at all necessary that rich people should be gluttons, or effeminate; and, as a matter of fact, the families of the aristocracy, in England, at any rate, are, or were, a few years ago, above the average in size, since that "affluent" class was very improvident.

I cannot think what tempted the author of the Essay in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW to assert that statistical evidence proves that "a large community, other things being equal, is capable of producing more food and more wealth generally, man per man, than is possible in a smaller community." He surely forgets the case of China and its more fortunate neighbour, Australia. In China, with its 420,000,000 inhabitants (Simon, 1888), wages are so low that famines constantly arise and sweep away not hundreds but millions in a year or two. In Australia, wages are at present so high that the working classes are able to secure and maintain a working day of eight hours, and are at all times amply supplied with food and other necessities.

Here, again, comes an argument which I am very familiar with, since it is often heard in London from the lips of the disciples of

Mr. Henry George, and from the Social Democrats who have lately been so novel a feature in modern London. Mr. Mulhall is cited as showing how enormously the world's population has increased during the nineteenth century; and it is thought that this fact somehow or other contradicts the Malthusian theory—viz., that population tends physiologically to double in the space of fifteen years. "Malthus," says the writer, "overlooked the importance of transit in his calculations. In the foregoing pages we see that, in the year 1800, the number of inhabitants per square mile, in the United Kingdom, was 131, and that in 1880 it was 290, which is more than double." Well, what does this prove? If population had doubled every fifteen years, as it might physiologically have done, instead of 290 there might have been 5000 per square mile in 1880, so that population has evidently been enormously checked in this century, even in England from some cause.

Then, again, our author thinks he has made a point against the Malthusian theory when he tells us that the capital of the United Kingdom has doubled in forty years; it having been 4000 millions sterling in 1840, according to Porter, and 8840 millions sterling, according to Giffen, in 1877. That, of course, would prove that in forty years the population of a fortunately situated island might have doubled: whilst the real proposition is that it tended to double in about fifteen years; and not only the population of England, but of the whole human race—namely, 1400 millions of mankind tend to do so if they could get enough food. The Chinese, the Hindoos, and other inhabitants of Asia and Europe, and other thickly peopled quarters of the globe, are always tending to double in that time. But the chief mistake in this hypothesis of our author lies in his supposing that Malthus thought that the world tended to get poorer and poorer according as it was more and more populous. Here is what Malthus himself says (vol. ii. 1806): "To suppose that in speaking of these effects of the principle of population, I look to certain periods in future when population will exceed the means of subsistence in a much greater degree than at present, and that the evils arising from this principle are rather in anticipation than in existence is, I must again repeat, a total misconception of the argument. Poverty and not absolute famine is the specific effect of the principle of population, as I have endeavoured to show. Many countries are now suffering all the evils which can ever be expected to flow from the principle; and even if we were arrived at the absolute limit to all further increase of produce, a point which we shall certainly never reach, I should by no means expect that these evils would be in any marked degree aggravated."

The truth is, as Mr. J. S. Mill says, in his *Logic*, "The attempts to disprove the population doctrines of Malthus have been mostly cases of *ignoratio elenchi*." Malthus is supposed to be refuted if it



could be shown that in some countries or ages population has been nearly stationary; as if he had asserted that population always increases in a given ratio or had not expressly declared that it increases only in so far as it is not restrained by prudence, or kept down by poverty and disease. Or perhaps a collection of facts is produced to prove, that in some one country, the people are better off with a dense population than they are in another country with a thin one; or that the people had become more numerous and better off at the same time. As if the assertion were that a dense population could not possibly be well off; as if it were not part of the very doctrine, and essential to it, that where there is a more abundant capital, there may be a greater population without any increase of poverty, or even with a diminution of it." All this applies to the argument from statistics in the Review.

The writer in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW remarks that "it is often said that if England did not import her food, she could not feed her population. Statements of this kind are altogether without foundation and are most misleading." And then he quotes Mr. Mulhall, who says that, "if England by any contingency were compelled to raise wheat, it would suffice to sow an area of five counties the size of Devonshire to supply all the needs of the three kingdoms at seven bushels per head." Mr. E. Atkinson, an American statistician, is also quoted as declaring, that the average crop of wheat in the United States and Canada would give one person in every twenty of the population of the globe a barrel of flour every year, with enough to spare for seed. This will sound rather incredible to the unfortunate inhabitants of Europe and Asia; but even if we granted that wheat can for the moment be produced at a cost of five shillings per quarter in Dakota or in Manitoba, it nevertheless will not enable the whole human race to double every fifteen years until it can be bought in London, in Pekin, or in Calcutta, for something like the price alluded to. If the United Kingdom were to try to feed all its population on the five counties spoken of by Mr. Mulhall, I imagine that the price of wheat in such a case would probably be at least 200 shillings a quarter, or even very much more. The cost of manure, labour, and scientific acumen requisite, in the present condition of agricultural science, to produce such a miraculous harvest, would make the cost of the produce far beyond the means of the poorer classes of any country to purchase it.

Professor Rogers further alleges, according to our author, that the labour of one agriculturist would raise wheat in England for eighty persons, and Mr. Atkinson says that in America, ten men suffice to give 1000 persons all the bread they consume in a year. These are curious calculations, but they have unfortunately but little to do with the main question of whether European and Asiatic populations can

be supplied with wheat and animal food, quickly enough and cheaply enough, to enable them to double in about fifteen or twenty years. We cannot help thinking that anyone who expects that such an immense supply is likely to be forthcoming, is dwelling in that paradise which wise men shun. Even allowing, however, imagination to ply her wings for fifteen years to come, and if we admit that steamships, railways, and telegraphs are immediately about to bring from all quarters of the new world incredible quantities of cheap wheat and cheap meat, as to enable every one of the ill-fed populations of Hindostan and China to betake themselves, as we have done, to a diet of cereals and meat, and to enable the world to increase from 1400 to 2800 millions, can our author not see that in the next fifteen years the supply might possibly not suffice to add another 2800 millions, unless the days of Saturn were to return and Nature showered down on the happy human race all that it requires to nourish and delight it without labour.

Our author candidly admits that it may be objected that it would take some time to construct the machinery requisite to render such splendid results possible. But he says, "the rapid recovery of France after the Franco-German war makes the old theory of capital no longer tenable." *Nous avons changé tout cela.* I am not quite sure what the old theory of capital is supposed to have been; but of this I am sure, that mankind must be fed, clothed, and housed, and provided with railways, steamships, and agricultural implements, before they can produce and distribute the deluge of food promised us by Mr. Atkinson and Mr. Thorold Rogers. That part of the wealth of a country which is represented by houses and manufactured goods can be increased without limit; but food supplies can only be plentiful when there is not too great a pressure of population on the powers of the soil; since it is well known that the greater number of bushels of wheat which we demand per acre from the land, the greater will be the proportional cost of production. This is a piece of knowledge well known to all farmers who are forced to apply high cultivation in countries like this.

"The prediction," says our author, "that the earth will eventually be overcrowded is a mere assumption." Precisely; but who asserted this? Not Malthus, nor any of his intelligent followers. Indeed, all modern Malthusians believe the very contrary. They point to France as a clear proof that the human race or some of that race, are intelligent enough to prefer the checks of prudent restriction of the birth-rate to the horrible checks which, even at present, decimate so many other nations less civilized and less fortunate than they. Our author says that "the quantity of food raised per acre will very probably be increased in the future, as it has been in the past." And, although he admits that there may be

a limit to the production of corn to the acre, yet he points out that no one knows what that limit is. He then cites the example of the excellent sewage farm at Croydon; but is probably not aware that wheat is scarcely ever grown on that farm, because it is found ill-suited for corn and best suited for the production of roots and grass. Mr. Thorold Rogers has, therefore, based his supposition that one hundred bushels of wheat might be produced per acre by the use of town sewage on a rather narrow induction. Besides which, it will be time enough for the race to begin to increase recklessly like the lower animals when food becomes as plentiful as we are encouraged by Mr. T. Rogers and Mr. Mulhall to expect it to be. It would be evidently madness in us to increase instinctively, so long as wheat and meat still remain as dear and scarce as they are at present in Europe.

It seems (p. 293) that our author had hoped better things from Mr. Herbert Spencer; for that author is quoted as teaching that progress has been and will be induced by pressure on the means of subsistence. But, then, he is comforted by remembering that, "when Mr. H. Spencer wrote his *Principles of Biology*, he had not access to the statistics which Mulhall, Giffen, L. Levy, and Thorold Rogers have since employed. These statistics seems to render his theory that danger from deficiency of food originates with increase of population untenable."

What Mr. Spencer said is given in a footnote and is as follows: "But the danger of death which does not diminish is that produced by augmentation of numbers itself—the danger from deficiency of food."

In page 294 our author asserts that increase of population has been one of the factors of progress. Surely the real meaning of this is, as Malthus showed, that in proportion as men become more civilized and more scientific they have by their greater knowledge of Nature, been able to raise more food, and this has consequently enabled a greater population to exist. When a new country is peopled a rapid increase of population is a benefit if there is plenty of fertile soil; but when once population has increased, as it has in Europe, for the division of labour to be well secured, it is no longer a benefit, but the reverse, when population increases; because in this case the price of food tends to rise and chronic poverty appears with all its dismal consequences. Europe has long been in the condition when any increase in its home-staying population has been a great evil, indeed, nearly the greatest of all evils which can assail civilization.

Our author is far too great an admirer of modern as compared with mediæval England. He says that our meanest domestics would at present scorn to live in such surroundings as satisfied mediæval aristocracy in their manor houses. He surely forgets what a multi-

tude of poor people are brought into the world, both in our country districts and in the purlieus of our large cities, who live in most miserable dwellings, and never know what a good dinner is, and whose lives are curtailed by the chronic starvation produced by their meagre diet. In the Middle Ages, it is true, plagues and famines existed; but occasionally periods of great comparative comfort are spoken of as having been enjoyed by the rural population of England, when food, after such a pestilence, became extremely cheap. At present our poorer classes have, on an average, no chance of escaping a life-long struggle for existence, unless they emigrate, and thus betake themselves to lands where the pressure of population on the powers of the soil is less severe and relentless than it is at home. It may be true that "modern times have given birth to a thousand desires," but it is no less true that millions of people in modern Europe lead lives of the greatest privation, and experience constant difficulty in obtaining adequate supplies of the coarsest food.

Our author invokes the advantage of numbers as a condition of national existence. This in no way indicates that he disbelieves in the tendency of mankind to double in some fifteen years; nay, he actually assumes that Malthus was correct. "If more immediate causes," he says, "did not produce aggression from neighbouring societies, sooner or later, scarcity brought about that result." This sentence is quite puzzling to me, for our author had not admitted, in his previous paragraphs, that scarcity of food existed. Yet his observation is perfectly correct. As an historical fact most of the revolutions and most of the wars which have tormented mankind have been due to the intolerable sufferings caused by scarcity of food supplies. The indigent man is ever ready to fight for his life; but we may observe that it is by no means clear that a slowly increasing nation need be inferior in strength and military equipment to a fast increasing one. For it must be remembered that, in a nation where the birth-rate and death-rate are both low, there is a far greater proportion of persons alive between the productive and combative ages of fifteen and sixty than there is in a country where the birth-rates and death-rates are both very high. Our author observes, indeed, that "the physical-courage and endurance of the soldier are dependent on his supply of food;" and, this being admitted, it is clear that a soldier will be more efficient in a slowly increasing and well-fed country than in a rapidly increasing and ill-fed State. So that it is by no means self-evident that in future the savage hordes of uncivilized and rapidly breeding nations will have the power, as they have had in the past, to overwhelm the more prudent and better fed nations. All that is needed to prevent this is that the authorities in civilized countries should take care, until the nations are federated, to train the citizen in the arts of warfare, and thus keep him prepared to ward off the attacks of barbarians,

as long as barbarians exist as a menace to civilization. Our author remarks that it is not necessary that population should increase as rapidly as it has recently done. "Whatever be the true law of population," he says, "it is evident that the old theory that population expands with prosperity does not tally with the facts." There was, as far as I know, no such old theory. Malthus merely said that it had always done so; but he ardently hoped that what he styled "moral restraint" (*i.e.*, late marriages), would serve as some check against early death and warfare in the future. But as late marriages are so much disliked by the younger portion of the human race, and with good reason, Malthus was rather subdued in his hopes as to the prospects of happiness for mankind. As our author, however, points out, the French nation, during the last ten years, has only increased by 612,000, whilst we have, on account of our larger food supplies, increased in the United Kingdom, with a smaller population to begin with, by about 4,000,000. This plainly shows us that the human race, if it only is willing and in earnest, can easily enough proportion its birth-rate to the expectation it has of obtaining supplies of food. Curiously enough, London, with a population of 4,250,000, and Scotland, with a population of not quite 4,000,000, produced, each of them, a surplus of births over deaths, exceeding that of France in 1886, which was only 52,000 for that year. Naturally it is quite unnecessary for us to increase quite so rapidly as that, even if we have free trade in corn.

"No doubt," exclaims our author, "it is the existing unequal distribution of wealth that hides these facts from general view. Abuses are notoriously long-lived, and error dies hard. After nearly a century of pernicious life in England, Malthus's doctrine, so fondly cherished by the affluent, is bound to wane under the light of modern statistics. With it will die an older and more pernicious belief, that God has ordained the poor man's lot with its attendant hopelessness and misery. The dawn of a brighter era seems to be breaking, when, in due time, it will be perceived that poverty, and well nigh all the evils of life, arise from man's ignorance and selfishness, and are curable as he grows wiser and better."

This, I submit, is extremely unsound doctrine. In the first place one of the greatest difficulties in modern times in getting a hearing for the so-called "Neo-Malthusian" doctrines, which are making such rapid progress all over civilization, comes from the opposition of the "affluent" or capitalist class. As Mr. J. S. Mill has acutely observed, it is the very truth of these doctrines which makes them unpopular with large employers of labour. These persons wish to have labour cheap; and, although they are often ready enough nowadays, even in England, to limit the size of their *own* families, they often object strongly that their poorer neighbours should imitate

them in this. If our author will be good enough to look at the *British Medical Journal* of March 3, 1889, he will see what is going on in London: and may perhaps agree that high birth-rates may cause indigence and early death even in the very centre of civilization itself. Kensington parish, London, had, in 1888, a population of 193,000, and a birth-rate of 19·6 per thousand. An adjoining parish, Fulham, peopled, it appears, by market gardeners, with a population of 62,500 in 1888, had the enormous birth-rate of 48 (47·9) per 1000 inhabitants, and a death-rate of 24 per 1000. What need is there to regard the unequal distribution of wealth as being the cause of the indigence of the inhabitants of Fulham, as compared with Kensington? Is it not clear enough that this terrible inequality of births is quite enough to cause that immense amount of poverty which has resulted in a death-rate of 24 in Fulham against 14·8 in Kensington?

In Paris, the same phenomena everywhere exist, and in an article in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* a few years back, M. de Haussonville calculated that the families of the poor in that city were on an average three times the size of those of the rich. The rapid multiplication of our poorer classes is, indeed in my view, the only cause worth mentioning why they have not long ago left indigence far behind them. Our food supplies have been so augmented by the abolition of the Corn Laws and the recent introduction of frozen meat from Australia and the River Plate, that there could seem to be no difficulty whatever in assuring a comfortable subsistence to all persons in these well situated islands, were it not that we have added on an average about four hundred thousand to our population annually for the past ten years. This, too, is the cause of the great mortality of the labouring classes as compared with the rich. A few years ago Dr. B. W. Richardson and Mr. E. Chadwick found that the mean age at death among the artisan classes in Lambeth was twenty-nine and a half years; whilst among the professional classes, aristocracy and gentry the mean age at death in England and Wales is now apparently about fifty-six years. The Registrar-General of Ireland has also pointed out the meaning of the high death-rate which obtains in Dublin, and which is due to the low average mean age of the working classes in that city. The mean life of the richer classes is perfectly satisfactory in Dublin.

It is not a little to be deplored that the very same discussion upon this question that was carried on in 1799, and for many subsequent years, between Malthus and Godwin, is still needed. The position of our author is precisely that of Godwin. That writer also held that it was "the injustice of man, not the niggardliness of Nature," that poverty was due to. If so, how does it come that there is so little indigence in Australia and New Zealand as compared with England? Both countries are under the same Sovereign, and have

nearly identical laws—laws which are 'more free than in any other nation in the world. Yet in England the extreme indigence of whole classes of operatives is continually brought before the notice of the public by the daily press. Denunciations of "sweaters" are powerful enough at present in London, at a time when we hear that native born Australians do not know what the word "sweating" means. Surely in this case it is the "niggardliness of Nature," not "the injustice of man," which is at the bottom of this striking difference. And no wonder, seeing that in Australasia there are, at this moment, 80,000,000 of sheep and about 11,000,000 of cattle to a population of little over 3,000,000 of people; whereas, in the United Kingdom, with a population of nearly 38,000,000 we have only 30,000,000 of sheep and 10,000,000 of cattle. That surely explains what is meant by the "bounty of Nature." Perhaps this simple arithmetical fact may make the writer in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW get over his objections to the theory of Malthus, a theory which is so plain that, in the words of Lord Bramwell, "it stares us in the face." In the name of all that is rational, I would ask our author why it is that people in old, thickly peopled countries should leave all their dear home ties and betake themselves to new countries, were it not that they cannot find a living in such an overpeopled state of society as they were born in? Truly it requires a subtle influence, indeed, to evade the manifold arguments for Malthus.

In conclusion, I shall now venture to give my own views as to the reason why the Malthusian theory has not as yet become the creed of all intelligent persons. Firstly, then, it is most unpopular to the natural man, who, in the words of Professor A. Bain, is inclined to believe that Nature having created man, must have made all things subservient to his happiness. Our strongest instincts are in favour of recklessness in this matter. It appears as if Malthus's theory threw a pale cast of thought over the actions of all young men and women, and devoted them to despair and celibacy. And, no doubt, as Malthus taught the world, the idea was by no means erroneous. Indeed, Dr. Bertillon, the able statistician of Paris, has shown that after the age of twenty-two celibacy is most dangerous to the health of men at all ages, and to that of women, in France, after the age of twenty-five. Hence Malthus's recommendation of late marriages as a proper check against over-population is fraught with danger to the happiness and health of both halves of the race.

Secondly, the political power having been up to this date mainly in the hands of the capitalist class in most European States, these classes have occasionally restrained their own increase, but have apparently wished to hide these truths from the poor: not from any avowed or well grounded reason, but merely from a dimly perceived

feeling of self-interest. "In doing this they have been the greatest enemies of the race and of their own posterity. The only real chance the Malthusian doctrines have ever had of a hearing has been since the great experiment which has been carried out in France of late years, which consists in the existence of an extremely low birth-rate among the native population of what Mr. Robert Donald (*Universal Review*, February 1889) styles "the happiest population in the world." In fact, in 1886, the birth-rate in France was only 23·8 per 1000, or very little higher than the death-rate, 22·7. Thus, the modern French, who are curiously enough the most married nation in Europe (Bertillon) are at the same time the most stationary in population, as well as the most comfortable in Europe. Here then, is a solution of the difficulty, the one which has been the last tried, and which is the best. Unluckily, French sentiment is against its practice in this matter, and hence the passing of the ridiculous law through the Chambers a few years ago which promises £40 a year to poor parents who bring up seven children in France. It is only paralleled in its imbecility by the Suffolk Association which grants prizes to those agricultural labourers who have had the largest families, and reared them with the least workhouse assistance. When Malthus's theory becomes accepted by the rulers of all civilized States, the time will inevitably come when the production of a large family (say of more than four children) in any European country will be discountenanced, firstly by public opinion, and eventually by legal sanction. And the sooner that the producing of large families is regarded, in the words of Mr. Mill, as the greatest offence against all who earn their living by toil, the better for mankind.

CHARLES R. DRYSDALE.



## HOME AFFAIRS.

THE month since we last wrote has shown remarkable progress, and in more ways than one. We have come at a bound to the verge of a system of free elementary education for Scotland, with all that it involves for the rest of the United Kingdom; we have found Mr. Balfour modifying with a stroke of the pen the Irish prison rules in a sense favourable to the claims of the Irish "political" prisoners; we have seen the pseudo-Liberal Chancellor of the Exchequer of a Tory Government further taxing succession to the larger landed estates, and thus doing unexpected justice rather than raise the income-tax; and, what is perhaps as promising as anything, we have found Mr. Parnell sitting at Mr. Gladstone's dinner-table. It is pleasant to think that, of these things, the first two are so many triumphs for "a discredited and defeated Opposition." It would never have occurred to the Government to give Scotland something like free elementary education if the Scotch Liberal members, seeing an opportunity in the transfer of the probate duty to the local authorities, had not begun to agitate for such an appropriation of the duty; neither, of course, would Mr. Balfour have done, what he has all along said could only be done by statute, if Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Carew, and others had not made the Liberal Unionist leaders uncomfortable, until Lord Hartington declared at Norwich that there must be some difference of treatment for the Irish members. Happily, too, this list does not exhaust the successes of the month. We have won a seat at Rochester, we have held our own at Gorton by an increasing majority; the Liberal poll has grown in the Enfield division of Middlesex; and if the fact that Mr. J. A. Bright has succeeded his honoured father in Central Birmingham counts against us, we have this comfort from the contest—that it has proved that where Liberal Unionism is strongest in the Midland capital, it does not equal the voting strength of that part of the Liberal party which has remained true to its allegiance. Central Birmingham may be Tory, but it is not Liberal Unionist—so much can be said with confidence. Finally, a general review of the situation ought not to omit some reference to the addition of a formidable battering-ram to the equipment of the Irish police engaged in supporting the evictions on the Olphert Estate in County Donegal. This government by battering-ram has in it the promise of much good. We may yet win this Irish battle

as much by the excessive stupidity of our opponents as by any action that we can ourselves devise against them.

Before we proceed to touch in detail the more polemical matters of the month, something ought to be said concerning the death of Mr. Bright. This is not quite the place to review his life's work. That may be done elsewhere. But there are one or two considerations which the disappearance of the great tribune from the political arena forces upon us. In the graceful eulogium which Mr. Gladstone delivered upon his old friend and comrade, it was said that Mr. Bright was happy in the moment of his death—that his work was completed by the triumph of all his principles. We believe this to be strictly accurate, and it is supported by the fact that for several years Mr. Bright was on the non-active list. During the Session, however, he always lived in London, and he retained all his great personal influence. He controlled Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain alike. It was his advice, if we are not mistaken, which kept Lord Hartington, on the one hand, from openly joining the Tories, and which checked the Radicals of the Chamberlain group from making any advances to the Gladstonians. We speak of two or three years ago—of the period which saw the Round Table Conference. The intervention of Mr. Bright at a later date was always in the same sense, though there was probably less need for it. It was his strong desire that the Liberal Unionists should keep together. The question may now be asked whether the death of Mr. Bright will produce any change? Much, of course, depends upon the pressure of events. We can well conceive that a few more electoral rebuffs would bring Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Hartington to the parting of the ways. Already Mr. Chamberlain chafes at the postponement of serious legislation for Ireland, and seeks to force the hand of his allies. We have seen something of the willingness of the Tories to push along the path of legislative reform, but the pace has been cautious, and the road has been carefully chosen. That they will go their own gait is most probable. At any rate we decline to believe that they have agreed already to accept Mr. Chamberlain's scheme of land purchase, with its land bank and all that it involves. The Irish landowners would certainly have a say in this connection. Hence it becomes probable that the time is coming when Mr. Chamberlain will be put to the final test. Lord Hartington, it is certain, will stick to his rôle as the friend of the Government. He is pledged to it even if it carries him into coalition. Mr. Chamberlain's engagements are of a looser kind. He has a freer hand, and Mr. Bright will no longer control him. To venture upon prediction with reference to the member for West Birmingham would, however, be an act of extreme rashness of which we will not be guilty. It is enough to point out the possibilities which issue from the disappearance from amongst us of a great political personality.

The filling of Mr. Bright's seat in Parliament has led to some striking incidents which do not promise well for the Unionist alliance. The story of the feud at Birmingham would be worth telling if we had space—not so much as showing the difficulties of our opponents, as the probable manner of their ultimate disruption, and especially as throwing fresh light upon the characters of two leading politicians, who are matter of profound study even to their intimate friends. There seems to have been some sort of understanding, as Mr. Powell-Williams admits, that if the local Tories could secure Lord Randolph Churchill as a candidate, he should succeed Mr. Bright in the representation of Central Birmingham. According to Mr. Chamberlain, who made a virtue of necessity in accepting the arrangement, Lord Randolph fought shy, and in May of last year to Mr. Chamberlain, again in November to Mr. Powell-Williams, and a third time in March last to Mr. Chamberlain, he declared that he did not wish to leave South Paddington. It was in November that the Liberal Unionists opened negotiations with Mr. J. A. Bright, communicating the fact to their local allies. The latter made no objection, but still hugged the belief that Lord Randolph would come forward at the proper time. When the vacancy came about the other day, they trooped up to London to give a formal invitation to their chosen champion; and they were encouraged, by a remarkable article in the *Birmingham Daily Post* of the same day, supporting the candidature of Lord Randolph, to believe that they might count upon the aid of Mr. Chamberlain. Lord Randolph himself was willing, but he put himself in the hands of three friends—Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Lord Hartington, and the member for West Birmingham—who promptly advised a refusal of the invitation. The Birmingham Tories went home in a rage and declined to co-operate with the Unionists, so that for several days it seemed as if the Gladstonian candidate—Mr. Phipson Beale, Q.C.—might appropriate the seat. Constant pressure from London and the sudden appearance in the town of Mr. Balfour, the Chief Secretary, who implored his Tory friends to disappoint the hopes of the Gladstonians, were ultimately effective in arranging the difficulty, and in the end Mr. John Albert Bright was triumphantly returned. Mr. Chamberlain did not venture into Birmingham during the election. The Tories told him plainly that they would not answer for the result if he appeared, and charges of treachery were freely hurled at him. Since then the Tory caucus has, by formal resolution, declared that it cannot again work with the Liberal Unionists. We have given Mr. Chamberlain's reply in stating the case, but the situation has been further complicated by a very explicit denial from Lord Randolph Churchill of the story that he was unwilling in November last to go to Birmingham. The controversy is causing vast excitement in the Midlands.

There is no doubt whatever we were very badly beaten at Bir-

mingham. The numbers were—for J. A. Bright, 5621 ; for Beale, 2561, giving a Unionist majority of 3060. Mr. Bright polled 632 more votes than were given to his father in 1885, and 1405 more than were given to Lord R. Churchill on the same occasion by a "solid" Tory party. We do not wish to assume that this difference of 1405 votes between the solid Tory vote of 1885 and the joint Tory and Liberal-Unionist vote of 1889, represents the full strength of Liberal Unionism in Central Birmingham. The suggestion is indeed vigorously denied. But we stick to our rule of taking the figures of the polls in their widest sense, and we find that Mr. Beale has more than half of the undivided Liberal vote given to Mr. John Bright in 1885. Allowing for the usual growth of the constituency, it can still be claimed that the Gladstonians are the stronger "half" of the old Liberal party even in the division of Birmingham which is certainly most affected with Unionism. A claim has been made for the addition of the Irish vote to the Liberal total in 1885, but we might with equal justice allow something to Mr. Beale for the Gladstonians who refused to vote against the son of John Bright. We have the most confident statement that Mr. Beale's poll fell some 1500 votes short of the calculation of his canvassers.

The capture of the seat at Rochester within twenty-four hours of our defeat at Birmingham, was a stroke of good fortune for which we had hardly dared to hope. It galled the Tories immensely to have so soon to make this set-off to their great triumph, the more that the event of Rochester gives, on a division, a couple more votes to the Opposition, whilst Mr. J. A. Bright counts but one to the Government. It was impossible even to parade Rochester as "a moral victory." In the case of Gorton, where the Liberal majority was doubled, the "moral victory" cant was duly heard; and the Enfield election, which brought the Unionist majority down by 500 votes, was said to be a tremendous Tory success. It seems to us that, taken as a whole, the electoral returns of the month are not unsatisfactory. We know now what before was doubtful, that there is not a constituency in the three kingdoms where a Unionist can hope to come into Parliament without Tory aid.

It is necessary to go at once to the proceedings in Parliament. The Lords have been marking time as usual, when they have not been engaged in mischief. The permanent Tory majority believe it necessary to extend the punishment of the lash to burglars caught with arms, and, spite of the opinion of eminent judges and of the evidence of statistics, Lord Salisbury will have it that the lash "acted like a charm" in stopping garotting. Consequently, Lord Milltown's Bill for whipping armed burglars has been sent to a Standing Committee for examination. In the Upper House one other thing only requires notice. The death of the Duke of B

ingham vacated the Chairmanship of Committees—a post worth £2500. This is little better than a sinecure. Lord Salisbury proposed to give it to one of his own thick-and-thin supporters in Lord Balfour of Burleigh, a young nobleman who recently refused a Colonial Governorship; but when it came to a vote, a majority of the House supported the appointment of Earl Morley, a Liberal-Unionist with a much better record than Lord Balfour. The Prime Minister seems to have deliberately encountered defeat rather than put aside a stupid determination to confine his favours, when they have money attached to them, to his own particular set.

In the Commons we have been permitted to see the second great measure of the Session. We are ready to admit that the new scheme of local government for Scotland has abundant merits. It goes beyond Mr. Ritchie's Bill of last year in various important particulars. It does not deal with licensing, but it not only creates county boards but the subordinate authorities below them; it does not permit the appointment of aldermen, since there are no aldermen in Scotland; and it *does* contain the beginnings of a system of free elementary education. Upon this latter matter the Government might easily have gone the whole way. The transfer to educational purposes of the whole amount of the probate duty which goes to Scotland, would have practically freed the schools, but for some occult reason the Government offered of the total of the duty only £170,000, leaving £100,000, or thereabouts, still to be obtained. It seems to us, without wishing to be critical, that the Government and the Lord Advocate have hardly been straightforward in this matter—that they have been anxious merely to take the wind out of the sails of the Scotch Liberal members, and to give a “lift” to the Scotch Unionists, who do not stomach the prospect of the next general election. And in insisting that all elementary schools—board and voluntary alike—should benefit equally through the probate duty, there was no doubt a shrewd calculation that the endowment of the denominational schools would be a thorn in the flesh of the Opposition. It may create difficulty. Sir G. Trevelyan lately declared that he would not give a penny of public money to denominational education. We have the strongest sympathy with this view, but we fail to see how we are to stand by it without losing very substantial advantages. We have in the proposals of the Government, the beginning of great things for the whole kingdom. To reject them without any hope of immediately replacing them by others, would involve a grave responsibility for which we are not prepared. Moreover, the difficulties of a system of free undenominational education are, in the present temper of our people, simply overwhelming. It would take years of agitation to abolish sectarian feeling in this matter, and common sense dictates that we should best of the present ~~offer~~ ~~offer~~ the creation of a sounder











